DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 482 SO 023 621

TITLE	Teaching Teachers about Law in the 90s: Models, Methods, and Means.
INSTITUTION	American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill. Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-89707-910-8
PUB DATE	93
CONTRACT	S123A00068
NOTE	86p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Bar Association, National Law Related Education Resource Center, 541 North Fairbanks Court, Chicago, IL 60611-3314.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Course Descriptions; Higher Education; *Law Related Education; *Laws; Program Descriptions; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Methods; *Teaching Models; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

This document is a compendium of teacher education strategies intended to strengthen law related education efforts by providing ideas, activities, and experiences drawn from the perspectives of veteran teacher educators. The book grew out of a conference on advanced law related education leadership exploring what is known about preparing precollegiate teachers for the 1990's and beyond. This comprehensive volume includes diverse inservice teacher education programs, ranging from creative strategies for workshops of short duration to summer institutes of several weeks. Preservice models for infusing law relate education into college and university teacher preparation courses are highlighted. In addition to presentations of exemplary preservice and inservice teacher education programs, an important element of the conference was reflective discussions among teacher education faculty, school district staff development specialists, and law related education program directors. The volume is divided into two parts. The first includes six articles on preservice models. Articles in this section discuss training future teachers in U.S. government and politics, integrating law related education into social studies using language arts methods, and a model for using law related education as a vehicle for teaching secondary social studies method courses. The second section on inservice models discusses statewide law related education certification, national teacher training workshops, graduate level programs, summer institutes for teachers, and community/school partnerships such as a mock trial program in Ohio, and the national MENTOR program of law firm/high school partnerships. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 364 482

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

TEACHING TEACHERS ABOUT LAW IN THE 90s:

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M.C. McKinney-
Browning

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 023 021

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
Youth Education for Citizenship
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

TEACHING TEACHERS ABOUT LAW IN THE 90s:

Models, Methods and Means

Produced by the American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.

This publication is made possible by funding from the U.S. Department of Education, grant #S123A00068; we are grateful to the Department for its support. The points of view or opinions herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Department of Education or the American Bar Association.

Copyright © 1993 American Bar Association
ISBN: 0-89707-910-8
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 93-72654

Contents

Introduction v

PRESERVICE MODELS

LRE at the Preservice Level: A Workshop Model 3
Bruce Bonar

American Government and Politics for Future Teachers 7
Kenneth A. Wagner

Law, History, and Education Policy: A Course for All Undergraduates 10
David Schimmel

Law-Related Education Integrated into Social Studies/Language Arts Methods 15
Ruth Norton

The Cincinnati Model: LRE as a Vehicle for Effective Instruction in Secondary Social Studies Methods Courses 19
David T. Naylor and Bruce D. Smith

LRE Content as Reality Dialogue and Inquiry 23
Sam Crowell and Phyllis Maxey Fernlund

INSERVICE MODELS

Statewide LRE Certification:

The Arizona Model for Developing Master Teachers in Law-Related Education 29
Lynda Rando

Attorneys with Class: Managing the Classroom Experience 33
Lynda Rando

National Teacher Training Workshops:

The ABA Summer Institute Model: Developing an Interdisciplinary, Collaborative Approach to Inservice LRE Programs 36
Howard Kaplan

Hot Tips for Training Trainers 44
Diana Hess

A Continuing Learning Experience: The CRADLE Model 49
Julia P. Hardin

Graduate Level Programs:

LRE Graduate School—Doing It on Your Own 52
Alan Markowitz

Twenty Years of Law-Related Education at Michigan State University 55
Timothy H. Little

Summer Institutes for Teachers:

The Summer Institute as an Inservice Model 60
Jennifer Bloom

P.A.T.C.H./L.Y.C. 5-Day LRE Summer Institute 65
Thomas J. O'Donnell

Community/School Partnerships:

The Ohio Mock Trial Program: A Cornerstone for Law-Related Education in Ohio 67
Debra Hallock Phillips

The Jefferson Meeting 72
Mary E. Kennedy

Attorneys Take Their Case to Class: The National MENTOR Program—Law Firm/High School Partnerships 76
Jo Rosner

Introduction

Eighteen years ago, the ABA Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship (ABA/YEFC) produced a how-to guide for teaching elementary and secondary teachers about the law. A sure sign of its continued value is that it remains widely used by law-related educators and resource people. We hope that this new compendium of teacher education strategies, *Teaching Teachers About Law in the 90s*, will enjoy the same success.

Teaching Teachers About Law in the 90s results from the ABA/YEFC's successful October 1991 Advanced Law-Related Education Leadership Conference. Conference participants explored what we know--and don't know--about preparing precollegiate teachers for the 1990s and beyond. Included in this comprehensive volume are diverse inservice teacher education programs, ranging from creative strategies for workshops of short duration to summer institutes of several weeks. Also highlighted are preservice models for infusing law-related education into college and university teacher preparation courses.

Conceived as a guide to strenghten LRE teacher education efforts, *Teaching Teachers About Law in the 90s* provides ideas, activities and experiences drawn from the perspectives of veteran teacher educators. In addition to presentations of exemplary preservice and inservice teacher education programs, an important element of the conference was the reflective discussions among our diverse participants. They included major stake holders in teacher preparation...college and university teacher education faculty, school district staff development specialists, and LRE program directors. Conference discussion groups served to inform, evaluate, and stimulate our thinking about the effectiveness of teacher education practice as it relates to LRE.

Guiding the ABA/YEFC's planning and implementation of this conference were members of our Teacher Education Consulting Board. My special thanks to Chair David Naylor of the University of Cincinnati and members Dorothy Skeel, Vanderbilt University; Charlotte Anderson, Education for Global Involvement; Phyllis Fernlund, California State University at San Bernadino; and the late Arlene Gallagher, Elms College. The creative and stimulating dialogue that was a hallmark of the conference clearly reflected the Board's efforts.

My special thanks, too, to the many talented law-related education professionals whose deep caring about this field was demonstrated by the creative model programs shared at the conference and described in the following pages.

Finally, my thanks to ABA/YEFC project coordinator Paula Nessel for her leadership, tenacity and creativity in coordinating this conference and to Lanita Hayes Thomas and Beverley Ware whose energy, enthusiasm and support are always appreciated.

MABEL C. MCKINNEY-BROWNING
Staff Director
Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship
American Bar Association

Preservice Models

LRE at the Preservice Level: A Workshop Model

Bruce Bonar

At the end of the workshop, one participant wrote: "The sessions on law-related education gave me a new insight into how to apply LRE to a classroom." Another said: "I am glad to have finally seen a roleplaying situation enacted. I have always wondered exactly how to go about using one in the classroom." A third wrote: "I strongly believe that if our state legislators were to sit in on one of these sessions, then LRE would soon be mandatory for all educators in the state."

Most experienced workshop leaders would be pleased with such comments regarding their training sessions. Yet, these comments were made by college seniors who participated in a unique LRE training program at Eastern Kentucky University.

Since 1987, all elementary student teachers at EKU have received one and one all days of LRE training, taught at least one LRE lesson or unit and participated in a debriefing session related to their experiences. During the one-day training program, students attend four concurrent sessions modeled after a design common to teacher inservice programs. These sessions are conducted by Kentucky LRE trainers experienced in teaching LRE, having been trained by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's national program in LRE. Topics presented at the initial workshop include "Teaching About a Concept (Authority)," "Literature and Law-Related Education," "Simula-

Bruce Bonar is Director of the Model Laboratory School, Eastern Kentucky University. For further information, contact him at the Model Laboratory School, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY 40475; 606/622-1032.

tions," "Using Community Resource Persons," and "LRE Activities for the Middle Grades."

Most recently the training has been adjusted to accommodate the students' understanding of the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 and its emphasis on performance-based assessment. The preservice teachers are required to learn about performance-based teaching and write their lessons and units using a performance-based format presented during the training.

Since Eastern Kentucky University produces large numbers of teachers each year and ranks among the top twenty schools throughout the nation in teacher education enrollment, as many as 130 students participate in the training each semester. The initial one-day session is held after the students have been student teaching for several weeks, and the half-day training is held approximately two weeks before student teaching ends.

As a result of their training, student teachers are able to construct lesson plans developing concepts vital to law-related education. Working with the cooperating teacher, student teachers use these plans in the classroom and are evaluated accordingly. Concepts found in most lessons relate to rule making, need for rules and laws, authority figures, and individual rights and responsibilities. One unique lesson resulted in a videotape of a third grade class conducting a mock trial of Peter Rabbit's theft of Mr. McGregor's produce. This tape is being used in current LRE training sessions with the student teachers.

Some of the lessons or units taught by student teachers have been influential beyond the classroom. For example, a second grade class's videotape of Goldilocks' being tried for breaking and entering was selected by the school principal for presentation at a parents' meeting. Other activities have been publicized in the local press, and articles about student LRE lessons have appeared in small town newspapers throughout central and eastern Kentucky.

Evaluations of the lessons and units have been conducted. Students report that the lessons were effective with elementary children, with slightly over half reporting that they integrated the lesson or unit into the existing curriculum. The remainder of the students taught the LRE lesson as an addition to the curriculum, and most reported that their cooperating teacher supported their efforts to teach the LRE lesson, although only about a third indicated that their cooperating teacher

was knowledgeable about LRE. Over three-quaarters of the preservice teachers reported that they received very little assistance from their cooperating teacher in the preparation and implementation of the LRE lesson.

The preservice model and the findings reported suggest that student teachers can be taught to implement new curricula despite the lack of assistance from cooperating teachers who themselves lack knowledge about the subject. Ninety-three percent of the student teachers said they would participate in future training sessions in LRE when they became teachers, and most said that they plan to incorporate LRE content and methods into their teaching.

The preservice LRE training model at Eastern Kentucky University began and continues as part of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) program to support the training of educators and community leaders in the implementation of local LRE programs. During the early phases of the EKU program, several key college supervisors of student teachers and LRE teachers at the Model Laboratory School on the EKU campus were involved in the planning and implementation of the program. The support of these people has been instrumental in the program's success.

The EKU model is based upon the six factors identified in an OJJDP-sponsored national study in LRE:

1. *Adequate preparation and use of outside resource persons in the classroom.* Student teachers learn an effective method for integrating local resource persons (lawyer, judge, or policeman) into a school lesson. In the training program, preservice teachers actively participate in such a lesson.
2. *Sufficient quantity and quality of instruction.* Student teachers are made aware that LRE instruction must be more than an occasional lesson. In the training program, they receive at least 10 hours of instruction in LRE methods and materials.
3. *Judicious selection and presentation of illustrative case materials.* Workshop leaders use various materials and legal cases to highlight a variety of teaching ideas that focus upon an analysis of the legal/political system.
4. *Teaching factors that foster student interaction leading toward friendship choices.* All training sessions emphasize student inter-

action. By modeling these behaviors, teachers reinforce the importance of fostering interaction in the classroom. These training sessions become "activity oriented."

5. *Involvement of building administrators.* Preservice teachers are made aware of the importance of involving their building-level principal in their LRE teaching. This administrative support encourages teachers attempting to implement educational change.
6. *Availability and use by teachers of professional peer support.* Teachers, even experienced ones, sometimes need support from their peers, a need recognized and facilitated by the training program. Student teachers teach an LRE lesson during their student teaching, and later attend a seminar on campus, directed by an experienced LRE facilitator/teacher to debrief and share their experiences with other preservice teachers in the program. Additional lessons and a review of materials are provided during the training session.

The results of this preservice model indicate that while introducing beginning teachers to educationally worthwhile curricula can be accomplished during student teaching, the links between the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and campus supervisor must be strengthened to make the model more effective. Pairing cooperating teachers trained in LRE with preservice teachers would enhance the experience of both professionals. Their work with student teachers could increase the probability that inservice teachers will implement law-focused studies in their classrooms.

Given the recognized potential for LRE in the nation's schools, curriculum planners and researchers need to find ways in which the civic education of today's youth may be improved. Perhaps preservice and inservice programs designed for beginning teachers is a place to start.

American Government and Politics For Future Teachers

Kenneth A. Wagner

This course, designed for students who plan to enter the teaching profession, was developed as a result of my involvement in the Civic Education Enhancement Project (CEEP), a program organized to provide experiences in law-related education for future teachers on the nineteen campuses of the California State University system.

A course in American Government and Politics must be completed successfully by all students who graduate from the California State University system. On our campus, one section of this introductory course is reserved each year for students who plan to become teachers. All students who plan to enter the teaching profession, and who have not fulfilled this statutory requirement, are encouraged by their advisors to enroll in this section of American Politics. Enrollment is limited to a maximum of 25 students.

The course is team-taught by Dr. Dennis Heim, a professor of curriculum and instruction, and myself. In addition to completing the normal course requirements (i.e., taking the same examinations and reading the same textbooks as students in other sections of the course), the students teach a lesson to the class, either individually or with a classmate. Thirty minutes are allocated for an individual lesson, with 45 minutes permitted for a team-taught lesson. Professor Heim, at an early class session, explains teaching strategies and shares materials with the students concerning teaching with case studies and cooperative learning

Kenneth A. Wagner is a Professor of Political Science at California State University-Los Angeles. For further information, contact him at 5151 State University Dr., Los Angeles, CA 90032, 213/343-2236.

techniques. During the first few class sessions I also model ways in which various pedagogical techniques can be used. After students select the subject for their lesson, Professor Heim is available to advise and assist them with strategies that may be used to present the material effectively.

Students select their subjects from a series of lessons that I coauthored: "Becoming Informed Citizens: Lessons on the Constitution for Junior High School Students." If they wish, they may also develop their own lesson. Representative topics include: The Functions of Law, Compromises in the Constitution, Civil Rights and Liberties, Federalism, The War Powers of the President, Voting Rights Amendments, and Judicial Review.

Prior to teaching the lesson, each student writes a paper that summarizes the important concepts involved in the lesson, explains how this subject matter will be taught, and evaluates how effectively this subject was explained in a junior high school American History or Civics textbook, a senior high Government or American History text, and in the textbook assigned for the course. Thus, students are required to become familiar with the substantive knowledge needed to teach the lesson as well as to determine what pedagogical techniques, such as cooperative learning or case studies, will maximize the learning process for the students in the class. To ensure that this preparation is completed in advance, this paper is submitted at least one class session prior to the teaching experience.

Class members ask questions and comment about the lesson following each presentation. My evaluation points out strengths and weaknesses in the lesson, focusing on both the substantive knowledge and the effectiveness of the pedagogical techniques used.

As the quarter progresses, class members develop a rapport with one another that encourages the use of various pedagogical techniques. They are able, therefore, to observe and to experience different methods for conveying subject matter, such as case studies, group work, mini-lectures, game formats, etc. Student evaluations convey an appreciation for this experience and also recommend that other students who plan to teach should participate in this course.

The class is an alternative to the typical lecture-only format that students encounter in most social science courses and allows students interested in entering the teaching profession to begin thinking, at an

early stage in their undergraduate careers, about how to convey effectively to secondary and elementary school students the substantive information they gained in their university course work.

The following information is provided to the students regarding the bases for evaluating their oral and written assignments.

Major Items Used to Evaluate Class Presentations Include:

1. How effectively did you demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter?
2. Were pedagogical techniques used effectively?
   a. Was the Highly Inclusive Concept revealed at the beginning? Was the importance of the new learning explained? Was an effective test for understanding included at the end of the lesson?
   b. Was previous student knowledge tapped?
   c. Were students actively involved in the learning process?
      i) Was a cooperative learning technique used?
      ii) Was a case study method used?
      iii) Was some other technique used?

Major Items Used to Evaluate Written Work:

1. Concerning important features of the lesson:
   a. Describe the substantive knowledge that students are to learn; and
   b. Explain what pedagogical techniques will be used to convey this substantive knowledge to the students.
2. Analyze the accuracy and completeness of the subject as presented in:
   a. your Stephenson textbook;
   b. a high school U.S. History or Government textbook; and
   c. a junior high U.S. History or Civics textbook.
3. Examine the lesson for proper use of language, effective organization of material and correct use of footnotes and bibliography.

Law, History, and Education Policy: A Course for All Undergraduates

David Schimmel

Not long ago, Joyce Berkman, a friend from the history department, asked me what our school of education was doing to teach all students on campus about the current crisis in education. Joyce had just heard the latest bad news from Boston: the university budget was going to be cut again, and reduced state support for local schools was causing teacher layoffs throughout the Commonwealth.

"If you want to insure support for public education, you can't just teach future educators," she said. "You need a course for every undergraduate who will vote for state legislators, school board members and property taxes."

"You're right," I replied. "We do need such a course. But it's not just the job of the ed school; it's the job of faculty from every department that teaches about public policy."

Joyce agreed. That agreement led an historian and a lawyer turned educator to develop an interdisciplinary, general education course: "Education in Turmoil: Historical and Legal Issues for Citizen Action." The course is designed for students who will be teachers as well as for those who will not. Since education policy reflects the views and values of all voters, our goal is to educate all undergraduates to become knowledgeable, active, and effective participants in state and school district democracy.

David Schimmel is a Professor at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst and Co-Director, Program in Legal Literacy & Education. For further information, contact him at the University of Massachusetts, 265 Hills South, Amherst, MA, 413/545-1529.

The course has several parts. The introductory framework examines a diverse range of current perspectives including excerpts from *A Nation at Risk*, Kozol's *Savage Inequalities*, Ravitch's *The Schools We Deserve*, and President Bush's *America 2000: An Education Strategy*. It also includes historical material on the origins and purposes of free, compulsory public education in the United States, such as Kaestle's *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860* and Fass' *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education*. While about half of the readings and class time focus on historic perspectives, this article highlights the legal and public policy aspects of the course.

Constitutional Controversies

The second part of the course is entitled "Individual Freedom and Responsibility: Balancing Rights in Conflict." This section examines the way courts have resolved constitutional controversies among students, parents, teachers, and administrators. A major teaching method is the discussion of hypothetical conflicts based on recent legal disputes. For example, our discussion of freedom of expression begins with the case of a principal who censors articles in the school's student newspaper about drugs, AIDS, birth control, abortion, or student pregnancy because he feels they are controversial and inappropriate. We ask whether the principal was right or whether freedom of the press should protect "inappropriate" or "controversial" articles by students in school-sponsored publications. The next question is whether or not schools should permit articles that are "offensive" to women or to racial or ethnic minorities. After discussing the hypothetical and the Supreme Court's decision in *Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier* (1988) which allows educators authority to censor school-sponsored publications, we note the difference between what is legally permissible and what is educationally wise. And we ask whether censoring controversial articles in school-sponsored publications is the best way to teach responsible journalism.

The next topic is religion and education. Our hypothetical case concerns a proposal by a majority of the students and staff of Yourtown High School to allow voluntary, non-denominational prayers during opening exercises and invocations at school assemblies by students or teachers who wish to lead them. This raises the question of whether

there should be freedom of religion for those who wish to pray in school or whether there should be a wall of separation between education and religion.

We have several goals here. First, we want students to learn that most constitutional controversies about religion are not simple cases of right against wrong, but are complex matters involving legitimate values in conflict. As part of this process, we want them to better understand the views with which they disagree and to learn not to dismiss opposing positions with simplistic slogans or labels. Second, we want to teach about the differing views of Supreme Court Justices by reading *Abington v. Schempp* (1963) concerning Bible reading in school, Chief Justice Rehnquist's dissenting opinion in *Wallace v. Jaffree* (1985) on silent prayer, and the 1992 case of *Lee v. Weisman* about invocations at graduation. As a result, students also learn that the current Court is giving more weight to majority views than to minority rights; therefore, that some conflicts over student freedom of religion and expression will no longer be decided by the federal courts, but are now considered policy issues to be decided by local school boards.

A third topic is financing of public education. Here, we examine why most schools still depend on local property taxes which, in our state, resulted in poor communities being able to spend less than $3,500 per pupil each year, while wealthy districts spend over $9,500 per student. These problems and the unwillingness of the Supreme Court to use the Constitution to eliminate inequalities in public school financing are illustrated in *San Antonio v. Rodriguez* (1973). In contrast, the California decision in *Serrano v. Priest* (1976) shows how state courts can reach different decisions under state law. These cases, along with Kozol's *Savage Inequalities*, dramatically illustrate the power of voters at the state and local levels to determine whether there is equitable funding for public education.

Other topics in this section are academic freedom for teachers and controversial curricular choices. Questions for class discussion include whether teachers should be free to use whatever methods and materials they believe are best or whether administrators should be able to tell teachers what and how to teach. A related issue is whether the curriculum should include minority perspectives if they conflict with majority values and whether to eliminate controversial topics such as sex education and abortion from the curriculum

Part Three, "Equal Education in a Pluralistic Society," focuses on

equity issues of diverse groups from an historic perspective. It includes an examination of class inequality in schools, the history of women's education and gender bias, and the history of racial segregation and ethnic discrimination.

Citizen Action

While the above discussions note how federal and state constitutions limit what schools can do, they also emphasize the enormous discretion and educational choice available to local school boards and state legislatures. Therefore, the final section of this course examines the ways citizens can influence educational policy. To provide first-hand accounts of this process, representatives of various interest groups—teachers' unions, administrators, parents, and taxpayers—are invited to explain how they promote their goals. In addition, state legislators and members of local school boards discuss effective ways for citizens to influence educational policy. This section includes an examination of law-related education—its goals, methods, and materials—as an effective way to educate students to become informed, active and responsible participants in the democratic process. We also discuss how schools teach about law through the informal or hidden curriculum of school policies and rules, and the danger of teaching legal cynicism when school practices violate constitutional principles.

Methods

Policy analysis and critical thinking skills are emphasized in class discussions, exams, and papers. In all of our assignments, students are expected to state their position on a current controversial educational issue, support their view with relevant facts and cogent reasons, anticipate and articulate the strongest arguments against their position, and persuasively rebut opposing views. During this process, students are challenged to reexamine their own ideas and to understand the views of those with whom they disagree. As a result, these students should be better prepared to participate in the formulation of educational policy in their communities.

Conclusions and Expectations

As a result of this course, we believe students will better understand:

- the historic purposes of public education and the origins of major contemporary problems;

- how the Constitution protects the basic rights of students and teachers in public schools and when those rights can be legally limited;
- the broad discretion of local school boards to shape educational policy;
- the responsibility of each citizen for the quality of education in his or her community;
- the difference between what schools can do legally and what they should do educationally;
- the importance of incorporating law-related education into the curriculum in elementary as well as secondary schools; and
- how to be effective participants in shaping educational policy at the local and state levels.

It will be difficult to know whether our course succeeds. For, unlike most courses, its success cannot be measured by the quantum of legal and historical information learned or insights gained by the end of the semester. It will succeed only if our graduates use what they have learned and try to improve the quality of public education for the next generation.

Law Related Education Integrated into Social Studies/ Language Arts Methods

Ruth Norton

Teacher credential programs in California begin after students have completed a bachelor's degree. As part of their education course work at California State University-San Bernardino, students enroll concurrently in a methods course with each quarter of student teaching. This article will describe one such methods course and three activities that specifically address law-related education.

Social studies/language arts is the methods course taken concurrently with first quarter student teaching. The purpose of the course is to provide prospective teachers with knowledge of content, methodology, and assessment procedures for social studies and language arts instruction. The instruction of the course is based on modeling teaching strategies that the prospective teachers will use in their classrooms and the instructor's strong belief in the metaphor "teachers as decision-makers."

The 10-week course begins with five class sessions that lay the foundation for the rest of the quarter (see Appendix). The first class session is devoted to building a learning community and assessing the student knowledge of social studies and language arts. The second class session emphasizes the role of concepts and generalizations versus facts in social studies instruction. The third class session provides discussions

Ruth Norton is an Associate Professor at California State University-San Bernardino. For additional information, contact her at California State University-San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407, 714/880-5636.

of how individuals learn values, what common values are held by Americans and which values are inherent in the choices teachers make when planning lesson content and instructional strategies. The fourth class session presents decision-making related to unit planning and several possible formats. The fifth class session is devoted to an analysis of the California frameworks for History-Social Science and English-Language Arts. The last five class sessions have a social science discipline as a central focus. Related language arts skills are integrated with each of these sessions.

Law-related education (LRE) is integrated throughout this 10-week course. Using the metaphor "teacher as orchestra leader," LRE plays softly in the background supporting each session's content theme. All class sessions use LRE teaching methods which stress student inquiry and participation. LRE plays more strongly during the class session on values. Since values are the basis for the laws of our society, it is important for students to discuss how values are formed and to identify common values held by our society. In the class session on the frameworks, LRE has a solo part during the discussion of the History-Social Studies goal of "Democratic Understanding and Civic Values." This goal contains the curriculum strands of "national identity," "constitutional heritage," and "civic values, rights, and responsibilities." Finally, LRE is the major theme played during the class session on political science and LRE.

The LRE class session begins with the mock trial of "State v. Gold E. Locks." In this case Gold E. Locks is charged with unlawful entry and trespassing. After presenting the case and completing jury deliberation, which usually ends with a guilty verdict, the class discusses possible sentencing scenarios. Sentences usually include probation, paying restitution and community service. The students often decide, based on the evidence, that Gold E. Locks is new to the community where the norms of acceptable behavior are different and therefore, community service is necessary to learn new norms.

After the mock trial, the class is led through a discussion related to the implementation of mock trials in elementary classrooms. The following questions are used to lead the discussion:

Before conducting a mock trial, what would you do to prepare the children? What do the children need to know before using a mock trial?

What do children learn from this mock trial?

How would you explain "reasonable doubt" to children?

How do you help students understand "intent" as it applies to the law?

Does the law have room for feelings?

Using mock trials and role playing takes a considerable amount of time. How would you justify the use of such strategies?

The students' responses to these questions usually result in defining such concepts as justice, values, evidence, eyewitness, point of view and consequences for actions. The students emphasize the need to "take the time." Inevitably the students discuss using mock trial learning experiences to help children make connections to their real lives. The connections presented are related to classroom management and discipline situations and to helping children understand the values presented by gangs, for example, thus providing children with alternatives to the pressures of joining gangs.

The next activity of this class session is a discussion of civic values. In preparation for the activity, students have listed ways their teaching, explicitly or implicitly, helps children learn about justice, equality, truth, authority, responsibility, participation, personal obligation for the public good, diversity, privacy, freedom, due process, human rights, respect for persons and property. In comparing their lists students generally draw two conclusions: 1) most of these values are taught through implicit means and 2) most of these values are taught through the classroom management and discipline procedures used by the teacher.

The final activity of the class session is a presentation of various LRE curriculum materials. The point is made that these materials provide an explicit method to teach civic values. Specifically, the "Thinking About Rules" activity from *Law in a Free Society* is reviewed. After the review the students, in cooperative groups, analyze their classroom rules to determine if their rules are "good" rules and the results of their analyses are discussed. The emphasis in this discussion is creating democratic classrooms.

Several positive outcomes have resulted from the integration of LRE in this course. The prospective teachers begin to reflect on their values, how their values influence the teaching and management decisions they make, and how their values may conflict with the implicit values of the curriculum materials and teaching methods they are required to use.

The units that are developed include the teaching methods of LRE. In addition, students either incorporate LRE activities in their unit plans or choose the LRE option for their project assignment. These outcomes would seem to suggest that the integration is successful.

APPENDIX
EELB 341—CURRICULUM & METHODS II

REQUIRED TEXTS:
Hunkins, F.P., Jetter, J. & Maxey, P. *Social Studies in the Elementary Schools*
Petty, W.T., Petty, D.C. & Becking, M.E. *Experiences in Language*
Spier, P.—"People"
California *History-Social Science Framework*
California *English-Language Arts Framework*
Five articles will be distributed by the instructor

COURSE OBJECTIVES: The prospective teacher will—

1. differentiate between concept, fact, generalization, and topic;
2. demonstrate knowledge of content and methodology for teaching social studies and language arts;
3. demonstrate knowledge of assessment procedures in social studies and language arts learning;
4. apply the goals/strands of the state frameworks in planning a unit;
5. utilize a variety of resources (technology, print, non-print, human, community) for instruction;
6. demonstrate knowledge of a variety of teaching strategies;
7. demonstrate knowledge of diversity in pupils and apply that knowledge during planning and teaching;
8. plan and implement an integrated social studies unit during student teaching;
9. demonstrate ability to reflect on his/her teaching skills; and
10. demonstrate knowledge of issues, resources, and teaching strategies in the areas of law-related education and technology.

The Cincinnati Model: LRE as a Vehicle for Effective Instruction in Secondary Social Studies Methods Courses

David T. Naylor and Bruce D. Smith

The relationship between LRE and social studies is tight and dynamic. They share a common goal, the enhancement of young people's ability to function more knowledgeably, more skillfully, and more responsibly in their lifetime office of citizen. The priorities, content, and methodology of LRE and social studies are closely related to each other. Each interacts with, nourishes, and strengthens the other. In short, effective LRE is effective social studies education (Naylor, 1990).

In the secondary social studies methods course we teach at the University of Cincinnati, LRE serves as an effective vehicle for illustrating and illuminating the different kinds of content goals that comprise social studies programs. As students learn to differentiate among facts, concepts and generalizations, LRE offers substantive content to illustrate these curricular components. When students examine social studies curricula and develop criteria for selecting appropriate content to teach, LRE provides an array of significant concepts and generalizations to use. The same is true for illustrating and illuminating the values compo-

David T. Naylor is a Professor and Bruce D. Smith is an Assistant Professor at the University of Cincinnati. For further information, contact: David Naylor, Professor of Education, University of Cincinnati, 505 Teachers College, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0002, 513/556-3563.

nent (e.g., civic values), the skills component (e.g., reasoning skills), and the participatory components of social studies curricula.

Social studies teachers must make sound, informed decisions about what to teach. We seek to develop this ability in our methods course. Students are shown how to identify and focus on meaningful, clearly discernible ideas. They learn how to design lessons and develop and articulate cogent rationale and goal statements for what they teach. In this process, they become familiar with common secondary social studies curricular emphases and teaching materials, especially textbooks. They examine and develop criteria for content selection and ways to use textbooks and other curriculum aids. Throughout this process, we use LRE to provide meaningful illustrations, including how LRE content enriches social studies courses. Examples of the latter include:

- how laws and court opinions reflect the thinking of a time period (e.g., Alien and Sedition Acts, 1798; *Dred Scott* v. *Sanford*, 1857; *Bradwell* v. *Illinois*, 1873 [upheld ban against married women becoming lawyers]; *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, 1896);
- how legal cases enhance an understanding of historical events (e.g., the Prize cases, 1863 [blockading of Southern ports and seizure of ships]; *Reynolds* v. *United States*, 1878 [polygamy]; *Korematsu* v. *United States*, 1944 [detention of Japanese Americans]).
- how landmark decisions clarify principles of government (e.g., the incorporation principle, *Ex parte Milligan*, 1866 [rights during time of war], *United States* v. *Nixon*, 1974); and,
- how court cases frame and illuminate contemporary issues (e.g., abortion, right to refuse medical treatment, euthanasia, death penalty, surrogate mothers).

Using this approach, our students come to understand LRE, recognize its value in social studies courses, and learn how to make it a salient part of required and elective secondary school social studies course offerings they will be asked to teach.

Developing teaching skills constitutes a major focus of any methods course. Our course is no exception. In it, we stress an instructional models approach. Our students learn a variety of teaching models and develop the skills to use them. We emphasize information processing models (e.g., inductive and deductive models for teaching concepts and

generalizations), decision-making models (e.g., decision-making tree, case method), values models (e.g., values analysis, ethical decision-making), and social models (e.g., cooperative learning). When presenting these models to our students, we frequently draw on LRE content and materials. Many of our students do the same for the lessons they design and teach.

As we seek to develop our students' teaching skills, we follow a four-step sequence. It provides a developmental process that enables students to learn various instructional models and progressively develop the skills needed to use them effectively. The sequence consists of:

Steps in the Process	*Activities Involved*
Getting a Sense of the Model	Reading About or Observing the Model
Developing Initial Understanding	Collaborative and Peer Teaching
Learning to Use the Model	Videotaped Microteaching in Clinical Settings, with Cohort Group Debriefings
Applying the Model in Real Classrooms	Using the Model in Practica and Student Teaching

Students first learn about an instructional model, then they practice using it in controlled, general settings. Finally, they apply the model in specific classroom settings and modify it to meet student needs. The lessons students plan and the materials they acquire during the methods course provide them with an instructional support base they can use during student teaching and their teaching careers. That base consists of an ample number of exemplary LRE lessons and materials. Since student teachers and beginning teachers often face multiple demands that severely limit the time they have available for planning instruction, they appreciate having this instructional support base and tend to use it frequently.

We also stress the importance of becoming part of a community of professionals with similar interests. To that end, we make our students aware of professional information networks and ways to become part of them. For example, one professional network involves generic social

studies. Students become aware of organizations (e.g., NCSS), journals (e.g., *Social Education, The Social Studies)*, and resources, including conferences. Special emphasis areas, such as LRE, are other important networks. In similar fashion, we make our students aware of key organizations (e.g., ABA, state and local LRE projects), journals (e.g., *Update on Law-Related Education)*, and other resources, including conferences.

To summarize, the Cincinnati model makes use of LRE as a vehicle for advancing the education of future social studies teachers. The study of LRE content extends their understanding of the kinds of concepts, generalizations, values, and reasoning skills that need to be integrated into a citizenship curriculum. The examination of instructional materials drawn from LRE helps students to discuss and reflect upon issues relating to what is important to teach and how to select substantive content that is significant for citizenship education. Lesson plans selected from LRE sources provide exemplary illustrations of instructional models associated with effective social studies teaching and help young teachers master these skills. Course requirements enable students to acquire a repertoire of exemplary lesson plans and materials, many of which are law-related in nature. Linking new teachers to the LRE professional network (and other networks) emphasizes the need for sustained professional growth and interaction with other professionals who have similar values and interests.

NOTES

Naylor, D.T. (Spring, 1990). Educating for citizenship: LRE and the social studies. *Update on Law-Related Education*, 14, 33–36, 56.

LRE Content as Reality Dialogue and Inquiry

Sam Crowell and Phyllis Maxey Fernlund

This article will describe a process by which law-related education (LRE) is made an integral part of the course "Curriculum and Methods of Social Studies," taught to students who are entering their first quarter of elementary student teaching. The primary purposes of this course are to provide an understanding of curriculum issues and dispositions about social studies as well as to introduce appropriate and effective teaching methodologies. LRE is consistent with these purposes and values.

General Description

LRE is reflected in this course in three ways: 1) It is a part of the reality of the overall classroom environment which stimulates social and legal issues within the class community; 2) LRE curriculum materials are introduced in terms of their application in elementary classrooms especially emphasizing opportunities for dialogue about citizenship and reconstructive issues; 3) LRE is also used to develop expertise in a cooperative group learning approach called complex instruction. This approach highlights the process of inquiry in the solution of complex problems involving value perspectives and critical reasoning. Each of these implementation strategies conveys different ideas and possibilities for using LRE in the classroom. Out of these approaches, three aspects

Sam Crowell is an Assistant Professor and Phyllis Maxey Fernlund is a Professor at California State University–San Bernardino. For further information, contact Professor Fernlund at the School of Education, California State University, 5500 University Pkwy., San Bernardino, CA 92407, 714/880-5650.

of LRE emerge: LRE content as a significant *reality* of the classroom environment; as an opportunity for substantive *dialogue*; and as process of *inquiry*.

LRE Content as Reality

Imagine if you will a formal, rigidly structured classroom with all significant decisionmaking centralized in the person and authority of the teacher. Imagine also, this teacher standing in front of the classroom asserting with great sincerity, "Class, during the next four weeks we will be studying about democracy and what it means to us." If you can capture the irony of this situation, you will see that there exists a fundamental contradiction between the authoritarian environment of the classroom and the principles of democracy. To be fair, this does not mean that the students will not learn *about* democracy. It does, however make the possibility of understanding the democratic process in action very unlikely. In fact students will tend to internalize the *latent* content of authoritarianism more readily than the *manifest content* of democracy. It is when the latent and manifest contents are consistent that learning achieves greater power.

Using LRE as a significant reality of the class, then, embeds the principles in the experiences of the students and in relating these experiences to historical and social events. For example, we may suspend all rules and authority normally claimed and discover how rule-making, censure, and responsible authority emerge. It is usually necessary to introduce any number of short simulations which require all of us to make decisions, to create a degree of consensus, or to establish some kind of order. "Orderliness" and natural law later become major discussion topics.

Eventually, laws relate to the well-being of the group. With simulated interventions however, the class explores how laws may also give advantage to certain members of the group, or may result in unjust decisions. Legalism simulations illustrate how adherence to particulars of the law can even lead to animosity, anger, and violence. Several generalizations are usually formulated through their experience and discussions: a) Law requires the authority of the whole; b) Laws are human constructions designed to address the safety and security of the whole; c) Our notions of order may be influenced by our perceptions of our natural environment; d) Laws paradoxically take away and create free-

dom; e) Laws are not absolute or infallible; f) Laws can be used for injustice, oppression and personal gain; g) Laws are not a substitute for positive human relationships.

Creating an environment in which laws must be developed, used, and explored provides an experiential basis to better understand historical events such as the Jim Crow laws, William Sumner's concepts of folkways, mores, and laws, or controversial social issues of today. Human rights, responsibilities, authority, oppression, and justice are often seen in a different light. This format leads to the broader discussion of social organization and legal foundations of modern societies. It is emphasized that even in elementary classrooms simulated contexts can be effective in exploring important issues. The student responds to the experience rather than a set of unfamiliar abstractions.

LRE As Dialogue

It is interesting that the word "feedback" has become an important communication term in education. As part of the vocabulary of information control, "feedback" is one-dimensional, directed communication regarding a specific outcome. It is information rather than thought. Dialogue, on the other hand, implies at least a two way, evolving conversation which explores the thoughts, feelings, and experiences of individuals. Dialogue emerges from simulations and the introduction of LRE materials.

Dialogue, in this context, relates content to the lives of learners. It produces meaning. For example, the idea of "order" is examined in relation to law. "Surface" understandings are easy to achieve. As students consider, however, the "order" around them in the physical and social world they begin to understand that order is often a perceptual rather than actual condition. It can be arbitrary, dynamic and rarely static. Thus they come to a "felt" understanding of its nature. If students then pursue questions of "order" in their own lives and begin to see that order involves decisionmaking, principles of relative consistency, and patterns of living, "order" takes on perhaps a deeper significance. LRE as dialogue enhances these possibilities.

LRE As Inquiry

LRE opens the opportunity to explore questions, problems and issues in multiple ways. A group learning process called Complex Instruction

has been an effective means of inquiry. Complex Instruction is a cooperative learning methodology that places particular emphasis on problem solving, concept development and status inventions in the classroom. The groups revolve around three to six different centers with different activities focused on the same concept, e.g. responsibility. There is initial instruction and problem-posing. Then groups cooperatively interact to deal with a problem situation or to creatively design solutions. Finally, the teacher processes the group activities by raising questions, extending generalizations and by reflecting upon the significance of their thinking in relation to more specific frameworks.

Complex Instruction builds upon social interaction and inquiry. LRE as inquiry in this context becomes a means to explore social inquiry.

Replication

What has been presented here are three processes by which LRE concepts and materials are used. By viewing LRE as reality, dialogue and inquiry, replication does not involve objectives, outcomes or syllabi. Instead other factors are more important and are left to the judgment of individual instructors.

Four factors seem important: 1) Decisions will be context specific. In other words, every course and program is likely to be different. 2) These processes require an interactive environment. A mixture of small groups, discussion partners, jigsaws and whole class discussion is effective. 3) There is an immersion into issues. Depth leads to breadth. As students go deeper into an issue, broad connections seem to take place. Immersion is essential. 4) Unless there is substantive processing of ideas, thoughts, experiences, feelings and attitudes the effectiveness of these processes will not be realized. Reflective processing is imperative.

LRE as reality, dialogue and inquiry provides a framework to process significant concepts and issues important to our society. The learners are viewed as active participants, the environment creates challenges and opportunities to explore, and the instructor mediates the thinking and activity toward deeper, more significant understandings of ourselves and our society.

Inservice Models

The Arizona Model for Developing Master Teachers in Law-Related Education

Lynda Rando

Introduction

According to the Arizona State Department of Education Research and Development, school enrollment figures for the 1990-91 school year show that nearly 600,000 Arizona students are enrolled in the public school system and there are 33,000 certified full-time teachers. In the state of Arizona, schools are mandated to follow an essential skills framework in most subject areas including social studies. When closely examined, the social studies essential skills framework illustrates the integration of law-related education principles and concepts. Likewise, the goals of law-related education are manifested in the curriculum strands of the framework. By twelfth grade, graduating seniors should be equipped with adequate knowledge about the law, their rights and responsibilities, and be skilled in dealing effectively with conflict and controversy. Last, but not least, when young people leave school, there is a presumption that they will go forth and become active and produc-

Lynda Rando is Director of the Arizona Center for Law-Related Education at the Arizona Bar Foundation. For more information contact her at the Center, 363 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85003, 602/252-4804.

tive citizens who will participate and cherish the principles of a constitutional democracy.

How well, then, do we prepare our students for the real world? What role does the community play in helping students understand how law affects their daily lives? The Arizona Bar Foundation and Center for Law-Related Education believe that the community and its leaders share in the responsibility for educating our youth about the law and what its means to be a "good" citizen. To help foster and build upon this commitment, the ACLRE designed a Master Teacher Program aimed at empowering teachers by increasing their understanding of the law. This teaching model, "ATLES" © (Arizona Teachers for Law-Related Education in the Schools) was launched in 1988. At this writing, 33 elementary, middle and secondary teachers are certified in LRE by the Arizona Bar Foundation's Center for Law-Related Education.

This cadre of trained leaders have been responsible for reaching more than 5,500 students in K-12 classrooms around the state each school year. Most of these students are receiving a minimum of 40 hours of LRE through a wide range of law-related activities, projects, experiences and partnerships with law-related community professionals.

ATLES © ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS, PROCESS AND ACCREDITATION STATUS

I. Admission Requirements. Prior to being accepted in the ATLES program, applicants must:
   a. Be currently employed as an educator and indicate a commitment to remain in the profession for three years.
   b. Have attended an ACLRE approved or sponsored LRE Awareness Workshop (three hours).
   c. Show evidence of having conducted a follow-up classroom LRE activity by providing a summary evaluation report.
   d. Complete an enrollment form and include letters of recommendation.

II. Notification of Acceptance. Applicants and their supervisors receive written notification from the Director of the Arizona Center for Law-Related Education of their acceptance into the program. A former graduate of the ATLES © program serves as a mentor to the

new applicant and notice is provided to both the applicant and the mentor.

III. Accreditation Process. Prior to becoming accredited in law-related education, enrollees must:

a. Attend the ACLRE one day (six hours) "Leadership Seminar," which addresses leadership in the school and community and the role of an LRE liaison. Enrollees develop a thorough understanding of the importance, rationale and benefits of LRE and its ability to help reduce the incidence of delinquent behavior.

b. Attend the ACLRE three-day (12 hours) "Training-of-Trainers" Workshop, which addresses the mechanics of designing, planning and conducting an inservice workshop. Enrollees are required to complete a comprehensive plan and make a 15-minute presentation.

c. Conduct a law-related education lesson or activity for another educator or another classroom and submit documentation.

d. Attend and provide documentation of attendance at an ACLRE approved (six hours) substantive program on a law-related issue or topic (i.e. Summer Institute). Enrollee is required to attend a substantive program on the law at his/her own cost and provide documentation of attendance.

e. Plan and conduct a three-hour LRE Awareness Workshop for own school district. Observation and evaluation of the workshop must be conducted by the ACLRE staff.

Suggestions for other model programs
From experience, we have learned the value of team teaching. We strongly encourage LRE leaders to design a training program that maximizes and utilizes the collective experience of school teams. Prior feedback from accredited teachers placed "peer support" at the top of their list as the most important need for becoming an LRE trainer.

IV. Accreditation Status

a. Graduates of the ATLES program receive a certificate of accreditation issued by the Arizona Bar Foundation. Certificates are valid for twelve months.

b. Graduates must reapply every twelve months and conduct or provide a minimum of six hours of law-related education services to the ACLRE. This can be accomplished through serving on committees, conducting workshops, creating LRE lesson plans and serving as faculty at summer institutes and conferences. Documentation must be provided.
c. Graduates serve as consultants and school liaisons to the ACLRE. The ACLRE contracts with consultants for services such as conducting awareness workshops in other school districts.
d. Graduates also serve on a number of committees and advisory boards and are active in many ACLRE sponsored activities.
e. Many school districts participate in a Career Ladder Program and award district credit for participation in the ATLES © program.

Funding for the ATLES program is made possible through IOLTA (Interest on Lawyers Trust Account), which is administered by the Arizona Bar Foundation Board of Directors. There is no charge to the individual or the school district for enrollment and participation in this program.

Attorneys with Class: Managing the Classroom Experience

Lynda Rando

Introduction

If "speaking before a group" leads the list of the ten worst human fears, then "conducting an LRE lesson before 30 little people" runs a close second. It goes without saying that it is not an easy task to be a good teacher in today's classroom. We expect and demand that our teachers are competent, professionally trained, adequately prepared and experienced in dealing with classroom management. Can we justify the same set of standards of performance from our community resource professionals who volunteer to make presentations in our schools when they have not had equal preparation for the classroom? It seems unreasonable to expect such optimal performance, yet we do. Perhaps we should be asking what we have done to ensure that the community professional's presentation to our students is a positive experience for all involved.

Arizona has taken the lead in designing a professional development course for members of the bar to help polish their presentation skills, develop good classroom management skills and ultimately have a posi-

Lynda Rando is Director of the Arizona Center for Law-Related Education at the Arizona Bar Foundation. For more information contact her at the Center, 363 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85003, 602/252-4804.

tive classroom experience. Piloted in fall 1990, the ACLRE introduced the first attorney certification program in law-related education in the country, with funding from IOLTA (Interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts) and administered through the Arizona Bar Foundation Board of Directors.

In spring 1991, a committee was formed and new program goals and final certification requirements were established. By fall 1991, 23 public and private lawyers had enrolled in the program; they will be certified by December 1992.

Recognizing that law-related education is a rewarding form of public service, the Arizona Supreme Court Rule (ER) 6.1 Voluntary Pro Bono Publico Service provides lawyers with options for fulfilling their 50-hour voluntary pro bono obligation with approved law-related education activities.

STATED PROGRAM GOALS

1. Introduce attorneys to basic information and current research relative to learning theory.
2. Illustrate how learning theory can be applied in designing instructional activities.
3. Model various teaching strategies and interactive techniques that enhance student learning.
4. Assist attorneys with design, selection and preparation of LRE materials.

ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS

Applicant must be:

1. A member in good standing of the State Bar of Arizona or,
2. A law school graduate qualified to sit for the State Bar of Arizona exam. The applicant may enroll in training and will be fully certified when admitted to membership in the State Bar of Arizona and all other requirements for certification are met or,
3. A member in good standing of another state bar. However, the classroom teaching must be conducted in an Arizona school. The attorney must be familiar with Arizona law.

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

1. Complete basic training course conducted by the ACLRE.
2. Complete eight hours of classroom teaching within twelve months of enrollment.

RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Attorneys must:

1. Recertify every three years.
2. Complete twenty (20) hours of approved LRE activity for any two out of three years. For each 20-hour year, at least eight (8) hours must be actual time teaching in the classroom.
3. Additional twelve (12) hours may be met by:
   a. Preparing LRE materials for classroom use;
   b. Publishing articles;
   c. Participation in ACLRE-sponsored programs

   (Note: Credit for materials and articles must meet the approval of the Attorney Certification Committee.)

Attorneys may choose which schools they would like to work with in the partnership or are assigned by ACLRE staff. The first group of attorneys to receive their certification will have worked with more than 735 students through classroom teaching in 1992.

The ABA Summer Institute Model: Developing an Interdisciplinary, Collaborative Approach to Inservice LRE Programs

Howard Kaplan

Introduction

From 1988–90 the American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship (ABA/YEFC) conducted a series of week-long national summer institutes for school district/community teams of K-12 educators and law-related resource leaders. In commemoration of the bicentennial, they focused on such constitutional themes and topics as the origins and articles of the Constitution, the American system of separated powers, and the Bill of Rights. The purpose of this article is to present LRE program developers with an effective, distinctive inservice model, based on these ABA summer institutes. I

Howard Kaplan is Assistant Staff Director of the American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship. For further information, contact him at the American Bar Association/YEFC, 541 N. Fairbanks Ct., 15th Fl., Chicago, IL 60611-3314, 312/988-5735.

will describe the model, briefly analyze its distinctive characteristics, and offer a few suggestions for using and adapting it.

Description of Institute Model Participants—A Team Model

The "target audience" for the ABA summer institutes was not individual teachers, but school district/community *teams*. Applications were accepted from school districts nationwide. Since these institutes focused on constitutional issues, they were held in the historic sites of Philadelphia (University of Pennsylvania) and Washington, DC (American University). Judged competitively, accepted teams received stipends to defray their cost of participation. Applicants were required to form teams composed of the following members: (1) a school district administrator to serve as the team leader; (2) four classroom teachers, representing two different grade levels (elementary, middle and secondary); and (3) a law-related resource leader (e.g., state LRE project director, lawyer, judge, or university professor).

Objectives. This model for participation is designed to develop a core group of support at the school district level to implement school programs for improving study of the legal subjects under examination following the institute. Involving representatives from the school administration and the community at an early stage facilitates their continuing support for developing innovative programs. To meet this objective, the institutes combined a number of complementary instructional techniques which explored content areas and provided participants with strategies and resources for teaching about them.

Institute Components

The ABA summer institutes included the following components (see illustrative agenda in box accompanying this article):

- Ninety-minute *plenary lecture sessions* featured three subject-matter specialists (e.g., law professors, judges, legal practitioners, historians, political scientists, and policymakers). The three 20-minute presentations provided a synthetic or conceptual treatment of the session theme, as well as historical and contemporary perspectives. Time was reserved at the end of the lectures for participants to ask questions. Speakers were encouraged to speak in an informal, conversational style and to both inform and challenge participants to think about issues related to the theme.

- Concurrent one-hour *discussion seminars*, led by lecturers, provided participants with opportunities for more in-depth exploration and focused examination of topics and ideas treated during the preceding plenary session.
- *Curriculum workshops* offered participants interactive strategies, including lesson demonstrations, and resources to help incorporate institute themes and issues into the curriculum. Four different series of concurrent sessions were conducted: (1) elementary; (2) middle; (3) high school American history; and (4) high school civics/government. Workshop presenters were nationally-prominent LRE teacher trainers.
- *Materials exhibits* displayed high-quality print and audiovisual instructional resources available from LRE projects and other educational organizations related to the institute themes.
- *Special events*, including group tours of historic sites, were scheduled to complement classroom sessions. For instance, the ABA constitutional institutes included tours/presentations at Independence National Historic Park in Philadelphia and at the National Archives and Supreme Court in Washington, DC.

Distinctive Characteristics

Interdisciplinary Focus. The ABA summer institutes were each organized around a number of general subject-matter themes and related focus questions. For instance, the institute on the Bill of Rights included sessions (interrelated lecture/discussion/curriculum workshop "units") on these four themes: (1) The Bill of Rights and the U.S. Constitution; (2) Freedoms Guaranteed Under the First Amendment; (3) The Criminal Justice System and Individual Rights; and (4) Equal Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment. Focus questions for the First Amendment sessions were, "To what extent is "freedom" guaranteed under the Constitution and Bill of Rights? How are sometimes conflicting appeals to fundamental liberties negotiated under our constitutional system? How does the First Amendment guarantee specific freedoms, including freedom of speech, freedom of religion/separation of church and state, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly?" These general themes served as organizing rubrics under which scholars and practitioners from different disciplines and fields could make diverse presentations which complemented and supplemented one another. As

such, they helped guide speakers and workshop presenters in preparing for their sessions.

Collaborative Instruction. This thematic organization was designed to strike a proper balance between the general and the specific in order to make the institutes' instructional process both substantively challenging and, at the same time, relevant and useful for participating educators. It therefore provides a sound inservice model highlighting collaboration among scholars, teacher educators, and teams of classroom teachers, administrators and law-related resource leaders.

Organization. A teacher participating in one of the ABA's constitutional institutes commented, "I thought the organization allowed the maximum amount of information to be processed in the shortest amount of time." To help achieve this result, several meetings were scheduled with designated team leaders, one prior to the opening session and the other midway through the institute. The purpose of the initial meeting was to review institute objectives, policies and arrangements, including assigning team leaders responsibility for designating members to attend different break-out discussion seminars. These assignments were part of an overall institute design to build team cohesiveness and promote sharing of information; other elements included regularly scheduled team-member meetings. The purpose of the second team leader meeting was to facilitate planning of school district follow-up to the institute (see the *Follow-Up Programs* section below), and to provide participants with an opportunity for feedback on the institute's effectiveness so that staff could make any necessary mid-course adjustments.

Follow-Up Programs. The real measure of the effectiveness of any single inservice education "event" is its capacity to develop a "critical mass" for ongoing program development. This requires implementing a well-conceived follow-up program which builds upon the foundation established by the primary training activity. School district teams participating in the ABA summer institutes received awards to purchase resource materials for use in classrooms and school libraries, additional ABA/YEFC resources, and technical assistance in planning and conducting follow-up inservice programs. In addition, they were also eligible to apply for participation in two special institute follow-up programs, a Model Site Program for school districts and a Fellowship Program for teachers. Application packages were developed for each of these programs. As with the institute, a subcommittee of ABA/YEFC

members and staff reviewed and selected applicants for the programs, in accordance with established selection criteria. Both programs were conducted during the succeeding school year.

Teacher Fellowship Program

The purpose of this program was to develop individual teachers' capacity for leadership in conducting constitutional studies programs in their school districts and community, as well as in their classroom. Nine teachers were chosen to participate in two three-day meetings in Chicago, combining program planning and curriculum development workshops, topical discussion seminars, curriculum planning sessions, and relevant field experiences. Participating teachers developed instructional activities published in the ABA/YEFC magazine *Update on Law-Related Education*.

Model Site Program

Three school districts were selected to participate in this program. Its objectives were to improve education about the Constitution and Bill of Rights in participating school districts/communities, and to develop strong, innovative program models which could be successfully replicated in other school districts. Selected sites were required to design focused programs of special events, ongoing activities and training, and/or materials development and dissemination. Among the projects developed under the ABA/YEFC's model site program were (1) a student-directed oral history program on the 1959 Alaska state constitutional convention (Anchorage, Alaska); (2) an intergenerational school-community constitutional studies program (Easthampton, Massachusetts); (3) a series of public forums on the Bill of Rights (Tigard, Oregon); and (4) student conventions to develop a district-wide Bill of Rights (Bellevue, Washington).

Using and Adapting the Model

There are a number of ways in which the inservice model described in this article could be adapted for use by state and local program developers. A similar institute might focus substantively on any number of interdisciplinary themes in the law. For instance, sessions could be organized around key legal concepts, including justice, liberty, equality, and power. Or, alternatively, the institute might present historical

and contemporary perspectives on legal systems from other nations and cultures (e.g., Islamic, British common law, Chinese, and Continental European civil law traditions). Since the institute is structured according to thematic units integrating different learning approaches (lectures, discussion seminars, curriculum workshops), its length could be easily shortened or lengthened. For example, many school districts participating in the ABA/YEFC institute programs used this "unit" design in conducting follow-up one-day inservices. The setting for the institute is a crucial element in its design, especially for out-of-classroom learning experiences. Statewide or districtwide institutes could select sites which provide these special opportunities, e.g. a state capital or a locality in which a historic court case had originated. Guidelines for composing teams might be modified depending upon the subject-matter emphases or program goals of the institute. For instance, the resource leader team-member for an institute focusing on criminal justice or juvenile justice might be a law enforcement or juvenile justice professional.

Emphasizing interdisciplinary approaches and encouraging collaborative partnerships among educators, legal professionals and other community members have long been trademarks of effective law-related education programs. The model presented here represents one design for incorporating these essential characteristics into an inservice program. My hope is that it will help inform and stimulate your own efforts in designing effective LRE inservice models.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
YOUTH EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP

INTERDISCIPLINARY
LRE SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR TEACHERS

Illustrative Agenda

Day 1 (Monday)

9:00 a.m.–9:00 p.m.	Check-in
1:30–4:30 p.m.	Institute Registration
1:30 p.m.	Materials Exhibit Opens
2:30–3:30 p.m.	Orientation Meeting (*team leaders only*)
5:30–8:30 p.m.	Opening Plenary Session (Special Event)

Day 2 (Tuesday)

7:30–8:30 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00–9:30 a.m.	Institute Orientation
9:30–10:15 a.m.	Curriculum Workshop Orientation
10:30 a.m.–noon	Lecture Session #1
12:15–1:15 p.m.	Lunch/Team Meetings
1:30–2:30 p.m.	Discussion Seminar #1
2:45–5:00 p.m.	Curriculum Workshop #1

Day 3 (Wednesday)

7:30–8:30 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00–10:30 a.m.	Lecture Session #2
10:45–11:45 a.m.	Discussion Seminar #2
Noon–1:00 p.m.	Lunch/Team Meetings
1:15–3:45 p.m.	Curriculum Workshop #2
4:00–5:15 p.m.	Follow-Up Programs Meeting (*team leaders/others*)

Day 4 (Thursday)

7:30–8:45 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00 a.m.	Buses Depart Campus
9:45–11:00 a.m.	Off-Site Group Tour/Presentation

11:00 a.m.	Individual Walking Tours/Lunch/Team Meetings
6:00 p.m.	Buses Depart Campus
6:30 - 10:00 p.m.	Institute Dinner Session (Off-Site) Lecture Session #3
10:00 p.m.	Buses Return to Campus

Day 5 (Friday)

7:30–8:30 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00–10:00 a.m.	Discussion Seminar #3
10:15 a.m.–12:30 p.m.	Curriculum Workshop #3
12:45–2:45 p.m.	Lunch/Team Meetings
3:00–4:30 p.m.	Lecture Session #4
4:45–5:45 p.m.	Discussion Seminar #4

Day 6 (Saturday)

8:30–9:30 a.m.	Breakfast/Closing Plenary Session
9:45 a.m.–12:15 p.m.	Curriculum Workshop #4

Tips for Training Trainers

Diana Hess

The national Training of Trainers model used by the Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF) is designed to help educators and outside resource persons (ORPs) develop the knowledge and skills to conduct training on CRF materials. The trainers are then expected to lead sessions on CRF materials at state LRE conferences, teacher inservice programs and summer institutes organized by the state coordinator in their home state.

The evaluations of the Training of Trainers conferences by the participants, along with feedback from state coordinators, indicates that a number of key principles are important to consider when planning and implementing training of trainers programs.

Select the right people to be trained as trainers. As with teachers, effective LRE trainers have different styles and strengths. However, given the importance of modeling in training, it is essential that LRE trainers are able to practice what they preach. Selecting exemplary educators and ORPs who already possess a sophisticated command of both the content and methods of LRE is essential if they are to be effective trainers. Attention to the fit between the interests and skills

Diana Hess is Associate Director of the Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago. For further information, contact her at the Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago, 407 S. Dearborn, Suite 1700, Chicago, IL 60615, 312/663-9057.

of the trainer and the type of training they will be asked to lead is also an important consideration. For example, most CRF LRE materials are for infusion into middle and high school government, history and law courses. As a general rule then, it is important for CRF trainers to have experience with those courses and grade levels.

Is being a good teacher or ORP a guarantee that a person will be an equally skillful LRE trainer? Not necessarily, due to the simple fact that many people are exceptionally good at helping young people learn, but are unable to work effectively with adults. However, it is highly unlikely that a weak teacher or ORP will develop into a strong trainer. Although it is theoretically possible to learn from bad modeling, common sense and experience indicate that modeling effective teacher/ORP behaviors is more likely to result in their replication in the classroom.

Make sure your Training of Trainers conference goals and objectives are clear and narrowly focused. The adage that time is the currency of teaching applies with full force to training trainers. It is better to have modest, yet reachable goals, than to cram a conference so full of important, yet disparate, sessions that no one learns any of them well.

One of the primary objectives of the CRF Training of Trainers is to become familiar with the rationale for using ORPs in the classroom and be able to demonstrate a variety of LRE lessons which incorporate lawyers, political leaders and police officers. To meet this objective, CRF staff demonstrate two lessons, typically a constitutional case study with a lawyer and "Police Patrol" with a police officer. After the lesson demonstrations, the trainers discuss how to recruit ORPs for training, analyze the LRE research on the use of ORPs in the classroom, and identify ways of incorporating ORPs into training. In subsequent sessions that do not involve the use of ORPs, the trainers are asked how the lesson could be changed to include an ORP. Conference evaluations show that this thorough approach, focusing on one objective, works well; most conference participants report confidence in their ability to use ORPs in LRE training.

Emphasize building a rationale for the components of exemplary LRE. Thoughtful trainers clearly understand, model and explain the reasons why the key elements of good LRE are essential. A careful combination of modeling these components (i.e. interactive strategies, the use of ORPs, balanced presentation) along with plenty of opportunities for discussion and reflection will help the trainers develop a

breadth and depth of knowledge that will enhance their effectiveness as trainers.

Include opportunities to practice training in a non-threatening atmosphere. There are a number of specific skills that trainers need to develop to be successful. For example, demonstrating a lesson to adults can be very different than structuring the same lesson for students. Once trainers have seen a number of LRE lessons modeled (which will help them to identify and experience those differences), it is important to give them the opportunity to demonstrate a lesson for their peers. One way to work demonstrations into a tight agenda is to have small groups of trainers plan a lesson together and divide up the demonstration between them. For example, one trainer might introduce the lesson, another lead an interactive component, and a third lead the debriefing session. While this may be somewhat artificial, the group preparation and demonstration does provide the trainers with some practice and feedback.

Provide plenty of follow-up support. Too often LRE projects develop an extensive (and expensive) process of recruiting and training trainers and then forget about them after the conference is over. Trainers need follow-up in the form of referrals for opportunities to train, materials for these training sessions, and plenty of collegial support from project and/or school district staff. Trainers who are able to keep in touch with one another tend to become more committed to training and enthusiastic about LRE in general.

One of the main reasons to hold a follow-up conference is to give trainers the opportunity to share their training experiences and learn from the experiences of their colleagues. In preparation for these sessions, CRF has asked the trainers to complete the following "Best Training Experience" form. Each trainer receives copies of the other trainers' forms and has the opportunity, in small groups, to become thoroughly familiar with a some of them.

Constitutional Rights Foundation

Best Training Experience

Name:

State:

Telephone:

1. Title of the session:
2. This session was part of: (i.e. state LRE conference, inservice, etc.)
3. How did you set up the session? For example, did your state LRE coordinator ask you to do the session or did you set it up on your own?
4. Describe the characteristics of the participants in the session. How many were teachers? What grade level? What courses do they teach? Was their participation voluntary or required? Were the teachers experienced LRE practitioners or novices? Were any non-teachers in the session? If so, who were they (i.e. administrators, lawyers, police officers)?
5. How long was the session? Was that too much time, just right, or not enough? If you were to do this session again, how much time would be ideal?
6. Did you conduct the session by yourself or were you assisted by a co-trainer or an ORP? Explain.
7. What were the objectives of the session?
8. What materials did you hand out?
9. Describe, with approximate times allotted to each, the various parts of the session (i.e. introduction, interactive component(s), debriefing session)
10. What comments were made by the participants during the debriefing session? Were there any specific questions you asked that seemed to work particularly well? If so, please list them.
11. What, if anything, did you do to follow-up after the session with the participants? This might range from making sure the state coordinator has your participants list for his/her mailing list to classroom visits.
12. Do you know whether any of the participants tried what you demonstrated with their students? If so, how did it work? How did you find out about how they worked?
13. What worked well in this session?

14. What didn't work quite so well?
15. If you were to repeat this session, what would you change?
16. If one of your training colleagues were to try this session in a similar setting in their state, what specific advice do you have for him/her?
17. Finally, is there anything else about this session that we should know?

A Continuing Learning Experience: The CRADLE Model

Julia P. Hardin

The Center for Research and Development in Law-Related Education (CRADLE) was established in 1983 with corporate support and has thrived over the last eight years with a combination of public and private support and the energy and insight of many dedicated classroom teachers. CRADLE is located at Wake Forest University School of Law in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. CRADLE's mission is to support and challenge teachers who prepare students for effective citizenship through creative strategies developed by teachers for teachers.

Central to CRADLE's mission is its National Repository—a clearinghouse of LRE lessons developed by teachers, either through one of our institutes or through their daily efforts at school. Lessons submitted to the Repository are reviewed, catalogued, and made available to other teachers either on paper or on computer disk in DOS or Apple Macintosh formats.

A successful model of "caring, sharing, and daring" experiences has been established in the form of week-long summer institutes held

Julia P. Hardin is Executive Director, Center for Research and Development in Law-Related Education (CRADLE). For further information, contact her at CRADLE, Wake Forest University School of Law, P.O. Box 7206, Reynolda Station, Winston-Salem, NC 27109, 919/759-5872.

on the Wake Forest campus and other locations. Called Special Programs In Citizenship Education (SPICE), these and similar regional programs are designed to help teachers develop and share lesson plans and innovative teaching methods, while at the same time providing continuing mentor and peer support within each geographic region. Participants are determined by a highly competitive selection process.

Special programs have also been offered for students, such as a recent institute on comparative legal systems held in Washington, D.C. Repository resources are used in the training sessions and new materials developed by participants are added to the Repository for use by future institute participants and individual teachers.

Teachers are identified for programs through grassroots contacts. Local and state education project leaders, education agencies and LRE organizations nominate teachers, who are then invited to apply. CRADLE leadership teams make the final selections. Once a teacher attends a CRADLE program, he or she becomes a part of the network, identifying new candidates for institutes and new lesson plan authors, and taking on leadership roles within the CRADLE community.

Funding for CRADLE programs has come from several sources, including the U.S. Department of Education and the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution. Private corporations and foundations also provide support for individual CRADLE initiatives. Costs for lesson plans shared through the National Repository are usually kept to $1 or $2 per lesson plan. CRADLE uses its regional and state "grassroots" network in its funding approach, appealing to foundations and corporations located in the hometowns and homestates of the CRADLE teachers who will directly benefit from the programs.

There are four basic components of the CRADLE Model for Teaching Teachers:

Weeklong summer institutes on a particular topic (comparative law, the Bill of Rights, technology, etc.) with some plenary sessions and many simultaneous workshops where teachers share their own creative lessons and techniques in hands-on training;

Mentoring of new teachers through a teacher-to-teacher regional and state network, initiated during the summer institutes and continued throughout the following year;

Creative lesson plan development and sharing through the National Repository of Teacher-Developed Lessons on Law and the Constitution; and

Continuous communications through the CRADLE newsletter (SPLICE) and CRADLE's electronic bulletin board, LREnet.

LRE Graduate School– Doing It On Your Own

Alan Markowitz

Several years ago I became involved in an Ed.D. program at Rutgers University. After completing a great deal of course work and revisiting the obligations of my experience as supervisor of social studies, I came to the conclusion that I really wanted to see if LRE made a difference in the attitudes and behaviors of young children. I had just read a research project dealing with this issue at the secondary level and was extremely intrigued to see if it held true at the elementary level as well.

With my experience in social studies, I had been involved extensively in LRE, and, having taught the Institute for Political and Legal Education (IPLE) program for a number of years, I was naturally interested in active citizenship participation. As social studies supervisor, I became more involved with the concepts of LRE at the elementary level. Fortunately, I became involved with the Center for Civic Education (CCE) and their Law in a Free Society curriculum, training teachers in my own district, and later becoming a CCE consultant. While this experi-

Alan Markowitz is Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction in the Roxbury, New Jersey Public Schools. For further information, contact him at the Roxbury Public Schools, 38 N. Hillside Ave., Succasunna, NJ 07876, 201/584-8121.

ence helped convinced me of the importance of this aspect of social studies education, I could find little research to support the benefits of LRE on student actions and achievement.

As a self-taught law-related educator, I approached my graduate school advisor and told him of my interest in this area. He explained that the university had no specialized program in this area, but encouraged me to utilize my own creativity in developing a research proposal designed to meet my purpose. My efforts were facilitated by access both to computerized literature searches and to members of the statistics department who aided me in designing the study. At the same time, I contacted the Center for Action Research (CAR) in Colorado which had recently completed a study of the effects of LRE on secondary level students. Utilizing the resources at the university and at CAR, I developed a proposal which sought to measure the impact of LRE instruction on the attitudes and behaviors of elementary children, replicating CAR's research. My role was to work with testing and measurement experts to revise the assessment instruments for use with a new population.

The next step was to plan this project in my own home district. As K-12 social studies supervisor, I had access to the curriculum and teaching staff for the project. Selecting from teachers who volunteered for the project, I trained them and provided them with CCE curriculum materials. The design of the project is described below:

The Impact of Law-Related Education on Elementary Children in Reducing Deviant Behavior Problems

Law-related education (LRE) had been identified as a system of instruction which may have the capacity to develop favorable social and behavior preferences among children. The research questions raised in this study were:

1. Can law-related education have a positive impact on the social attitudes and behavior patterns of children in grades 2,3, and 4?
2. If so, under what circumstances will this impact be most prominent?
3. Will children in grades 2,3, and 4 who exhibit an increased knowledge of the law also exhibit more positive social attitudes and behavior patterns?

The study included 195 elementary school children in grades 2–4 in the Parsippany–Troy Hills Public Schools. The classes were randomly divided into control and experimental groups. Teachers of the experimental classes participated in a four-day summer training program, conducted by the researcher. From September to December, all teachers taught the traditional social studies curriculum and also charted student behavior infractions on a weekly basis. The LRE program was administered between January and March. Pre- and post-tests and infraction charting measured any change in attitude and behavior. Much of the measurement was based on Hirschi's Social Control Theory as well as instruments developed by the Center for Action Research. Classroom observations and teacher interviews were also used to provide data for the project.

The results of this project did not provide clear-cut answers to the research questions primarily due to the large proportion of measures which yielded statistically insignificant results. However, there was some indication of a positive impact on children's attitudes toward authority and justice in the second grade. Conversely, fourth graders seemed to show some improvement in behavior with little attitudinal change. Finally, from the significant results, there appeared to be no correlation between increased knowledge and improved social attitudes and behavior. "Progressive" teachers appeared to foster improved attitudes and behavior while "traditional" teachers seemed to yield greater knowledge gains. A set of criteria was developed for effective LRE implementation in these grades.

In institutions where no graduate level program in LRE exists, students should not be discouraged from creating one. A network is in place to provide support and assistance. Computerized data retrieval systems and literature search programs are available in all major universities, and human resources such as experts in testing/measurements and program design are also at your disposal. LRE content knowledge coupled with the expertise and resources available can be used effectively to develop a project which may have a meaningful impact on our knowledge of the importance and effect of LRE instruction.

Twenty Years of Law-Related Education at Michigan State University

Timothy H. Little

In 1971, having finished my dissertation and doctorate at Northwestern University, I headed for a new position at Michigan State University (MSU). The dissertation had focused on law-related education (LRE) as had my doctoral program. Thus equipped with some degree of both credentialing and enthusiasm, I set about the business of infusing LRE into the curriculum of this new-found university home in the College of Education. The first graduate course in LRE was created, approved, and up and running by the end of the 1971–72 academic year. Time passed, and it is a pleasure to report that the summer of 1991 marked the twentieth consecutive year of the MSU College of Education summer LRE training program for teachers. The following narrative briefly surveys the evolution of the MSU program in LRE and describes both successes and failures encountered along the way.

Timothy H. Little is Professor of Education at Michigan State University. For further information, contact him at: Michigan State University, 1991 Rutgers, East Lansing, MI 48823, 517/355-4501.

The Distant Past (1971-the early 1980s)

On arriving at the MSU campus in 1971, I essentially found a tabula rasa with regard to LRE. The idea of developing LRE as a dimension of the Social Studies/History curriculum had the aura of newness about it and, as such, it lacked a large supportive constituency. In response to this situation, I assumed the guise of the old circuit riding preacher, making presentations at state bar luncheons, lawyers' auxiliary meetings, and the Michigan Council for the Social Studies which in time gave rise to the development of an informal LRE network within the state. This network proved to be most supportive in the creation of a university level offering in LRE for teachers.

Encouraged by responses from within the legal and the educational communities, a first course in LRE was created for teachers. Entitled "A Seminar in Methods & Materials for LRE," the class was set at three term credits and offered for the first time in the summer session of 1972. In updated form, the course has been offered as recently as the spring term of 1991. The demographics of the consumer for that first course in the 1970s, however, were far different from those of the 1990s enrollee. Specifically, the early 70s LRE teachers/graduate students tended to be:

- beginning teachers within their first five years of teaching; or
- generalists who elected the LRE course as an interesting course to add to their MA/continuing certification programs.

Buoyed by the response to the first LRE course, in 1973 the program retained and expanded the "Seminar in Methods & Materials for LRE" and added a new course on LRE and the social studies curriculum. Both courses "filled" readily, but the new curriculum development course proved to be a disappointment. The problem with the new offering appeared to be that our typical enrollee was a teacher new to the profession. These new teachers were filled with considerable zeal to not only infuse their own teaching with LRE, but also to attempt to inject LRE into the larger social studies curriculum in their districts. As teachers of generally low seniority, more than a few were frustrated by their inability to affect change in their home districts. Like the Edsel automobile, this was the right course at the wrong time and it was allowed to lapse as an offering.

The Recent Past (The Mid-1980s)

The "Seminar in Methods & Materials for LRE" course continued to thrive as the 1980s progressed. Sections were offered both during the regular year and the summer session. Significantly, the course also came to be taught in sites around the state as well as on the East Lansing campus. Three major factors appear to have buttressed the program during this time period: 1) the creation of the Michigan Law-Related Education Project; 2) the evolution of LRE scholarship programs for veteran teachers; and 3) the creation of an "LRE Master's Degree Program" at Michigan State.

Perhaps the most important factor in sustaining the MSU Law-Related Education Program was the formation of a new coordinating body for LRE in Michigan: the Michigan Law-Related Education Project. MLREP was created as a coalition of groups within the state that were committed to and supported LRE. The participating groups included the State Bar of Michigan, the State Department of Education, the Michigan State Police, the Oakland Intermediate School District, and the College of Education at Michigan State University.

The impact of the MLREP network on LRE at Michigan State was—and continues to be—major. Through the offices of MLREP, a series of LRE inc ntive grant sites were established in school districts with modest, but essential, budgets to spend for LRE training and materials. These sites typically launched one- or two-day LRE awareness inservice sessions as a part of their local effort. Teachers who were exposed to these training sessions came to represent a significant proportion of the summer MSU LRE seminar participants. The MLREP organization also came to represent a powerful network for the creation of a sense of the LRE "Movement" in Michigan. Sponsored by MLREP, such events as an annual mock trial tournament, an annual statewide LRE conference, and the development of a newsletter all served to bind together the LRE faithful within Michigan and to maintain momentum.

As the decade of the 1980s progressed, important demographic changes were occurring within the ranks of Michigan teachers. The "graying" of the teaching force took place with major implications for colleges of education throughout the state in general, and for the summer LRE program at MSU in particular. Many Michigan teachers had had their permanent teaching certificates "punched" by the mid-1980s;

there no longer remained an economic imperative for large numbers of veteran teachers to return to the university for further training. Concurrently, Michigan had fallen on hard fiscal times. With layoffs becoming more common and morale declining, teacher enthusiasm for curricular innovation waned. Given these conditions, it is not surprising that recruitment for the summer training program at MSU was adversely affected. Clearly, a psychological and economic catalyst to the continued development of LRE in Michigan was needed.

That catalyst appeared in the form of summer training scholarships for Michigan LRE teachers. The creation of scholarship opportunities for teachers anxious to work in the area of LRE had always been a goal and, to a limited extent, a feature of MSU's LRE program. Limited and/or year-to-year early financial support for teacher scholarships had come from the Michigan Lawyers' Auxiliary and the Michigan Bar Foundation. Fortunately, through the good offices of the Honorable Avern Cohn, Judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern Division, the Michigan Bar Foundation established the Irwin I. Cohn Memorial Scholarship Program. Since its formal inception in 1985, this program has brought outstanding teachers to the MSU campus for summer training in LRE. In similar fashion, the MLREP organization has come to provide MLREP Scholarships, as well as room and board stipends, for teachers who enroll in the MSU summer program.

In response to requests from practicing LRE teachers, efforts were made to create an expanded program in LRE that transcended enrollment in a single seminar. Unfortunately, the mid-1980s coincided with a downsizing of college of education programs and there was little chance that a new "standalone" master's degree program at MSU would be approved. As a compromise solution, a program of study was developed which made use of the existing option of an MA concentration in social studies. Through judicious use of social science elective credits and independent studies, a respectable LRE concentration was developed. A course and credit breakdown of this program was detailed in a 1989 article prepared for *The Michigan Council for the Social Studies Journal*.

The Present

As the 1990s approached, new forces were at work to shape the LRE training agenda in Michigan. Jacobson (1989) reported that some 92.5% of public schools in Oakland County, Michigan were offering some

form of law class in 1987-88. The State Department of Education's list of objectives had come to reflect LRE influences, and hundreds of Michigan teachers had completed the introductory seminar in LRE.

In light of this, we received repeated requests from veteran LRE teachers to create an advanced LRE seminar. With the assistance of MLREP Executive Director Linda Start, MLREP Program Director Shelby Vaughn and the input of many practicing LRE teachers, a new course was designed. This new course focused on: 1) substantive legal content presented by guest experts; 2) research on LRE as to motives for its teaching and its impact upon students; and 3) training in, and analysis of, the effectiveness of commonly employed LRE teaching methodologies.

The Advanced LRE Seminar has been offered each summer since 1988 and the scholarship programs have been transferred to students enrolled in the second tier course.

The Future

There is often a temptation to chronicle the development of an educational program as an uninterrupted, linear march to instructional triumph. In reviewing the history of the LRE training effort at MSU, no such temptation occurs. We have had our share of experiences with false design starts, curricular "turf wars," and threats of university program reductions. To date, the LRE training program at MSU has survived and prospered, due in no small part to the readiness of college administrators, LRE activists within MLREP, the state bar and the Bar Foundation of Michigan to support "the cause." For these efforts, we remain most grateful.

As for tomorrow, it appears that it will be, to borrow from Dickens, "the best of times and the worst of times." While the LRE network in Michigan has never been stronger and K-12 LRE classes are thriving across the state, there are clouds on the horizon in the form of continued downsizing of fiscal resources available for MSU and a concomitant reduction of curricular offerings. The months and years ahead will, of necessity, see a major rethinking of the match between perceived LRE state needs and available resources. Inasmuch as a static attachment to the status quo has not typified LRE thinking in the past, such forward planning should spur planners to make a virtue out of necessity.

The Summer Institute as An Inservice Model

Jennifer Bloom

The Minnesota Center for Community Legal Education at Hamline University School of Law has been in existence since August 1981. Of the several styles of summer programs that have been tried, two particular models have proven to be particularly successful, and are described below.

Legal Content Week-Long Institute

During June or July, always avoiding the first week of July, a four-day institute dedicated to one legal area is conducted. In the past, topics have included "Legal Basics," "The First Amendment: Bedrock Principles That Create Firestorms of Reaction," "Crime: A Debt to Society," "Rights of the Accused: Criminal Amendments in the Bill of Rights," and "The Constitution: A 200-Year Experiment."

"Legal Basics" is designed for teachers new to law-related education. Its primary purpose is to provide teachers with a basic understanding of the major areas of law. The other institutes are designed for more experienced teachers.

Jennifer Bloom is Director of the Minnesota Center for Community Legal Education. For further information, contact her at Hamline University School of Law, 1536 Hewitt Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104, 612/641-2411.

Each institute has four components. First, the mornings are devoted to learning about the subject area, such as basic contracts or new developments in search and seizure law. Members of the Hamline Law School faculty often serve as lecturers, with lawyers and judges from the community also appearing as featured speakers. Panels of experts are also used on a regular basis. No more than three individuals appear on the panels, which are moderated by the Center's director.

Morning sessions do not consider methodology, and unfortunately, they often demonstrate the antithesis of LRE instructional strategies. However, given the length of time available and the desires of the audience, a limited amount of time dedicated to lecture format is effective. One tool that has proven helpful to teachers is an outline of what will be presented, with blank spaces provided so that the teachers can take notes. This helps them organize and structure the information for later use.

Each content session is scheduled for 90 minutes. After experimentation, this was found to give the teachers adequate time without overwhelming them with information.

The second component, the afternoon sessions, present curriculum materials that can be used to teach effectively the information presented in the morning. On some occasions, materials directly on point are available; on others, somewhat related lessons are presented or existing lessons are adapted to the content. After demonstrating the lesson, the teachers discuss its application, often developing very creative strategies for its use.

The third component of each institute is the opportunity to learn legal researching skills. For each institute a list of simple research items is prepared, such as how to find a case when only the name is known; what publications contain the state statutes, how to determine what the Supreme Court recently decided, and so on. The law school's library staff are instrumental in making this successful. They review the list of research items in advance to determine if any are too difficult, give the teachers a quick tour of the library, and provide assistance during the exercise. Teachers are usually amazed at how quickly they can feel competent and comfortable in the law library, and many frequently spend extra hours researching issues of particular interest to their students.

The fourth component is a paper describing how teachers will integrate selected lessons into their curriculum. Many participants receive

graduate credit for the institute and are required to complete a paper. Others, however, choose to develop a plan of infusion to help them focus their thinking on potential classroom use before they become too far removed from the institute experience. Some papers outline present broad law units, while others explore one issue in depth, providing research and teaching ideas for classroom presentation of the issue.

Each institute is limited to a maximum of 40 participants, which allows adequate time to answer questions and encourages lively discussion. By limiting the number of participants, a sense of community is more easily attained, serving the teachers beyond the institute.

Update Conference

Every August before teachers return to school, the Center conducts a two-day conference on recent developments in the law. This conference is intended for teachers who regularly teach law, with many of them teaching several law courses each year. There is no maximum number of participants for this conference.

By providing information on the recently concluded U.S. Supreme Court term, on actions of the Minnesota legislature and Congress that are of interest to students, and on Minnesota court cases, the conference brings teachers up-to-date in an efficient way. They are provided with newspaper and magazine articles, court opinions, and a copy of a publication produced by the Minnesota legislature that details changes in the law. They also receive new lessons on the topics covered and information about new curriculum materials available.

This conference is very popular among teachers. Many claim that we do their homework for them by collecting information throughout the year, information that would require great effort on their part to find, and that we sift through it to present information that is relevant to young people.

The conference consists of one-hour presentations by individuals well-versed in the topic—individuals who argued the case before the court, wrote the legislation, or are responsible for enforcement of a law. Efforts are made to balance the presentations with presenters from both sides of an issue. A question and answer period is followed by a discussion of how the topic covered might be presented to students.

One session of the conference is devoted to "walking through" the publication that reviews the actions of the Minnesota legislature. While

the format of this session—which consists of flipping through the book, page by page, highlighting areas of interest—is terribly tedious for the presenter, the conference participants find it valuable, with some actually saying that they enjoy it. The key to success here lies in careful selection of what is highlighted combined with a sense of humor, as each year is invariably marked by the passage of some rather ridiculous laws which present the opportunity for a few light-hearted moments.

The two days of the conference are very crowded, and, for many, a bit mind-boggling as well. In spite of this, every spring brings phone calls and letters from past participants asking about the conference's dates and making plans to schedule their last summer days around it.

For both conferences, teachers are required to pay a small registration fee, with the amount of the fee dependent on the programs' funding level for that year. In addition, teachers who register for graduate credit must pay tuition to Hamline University.

Before planning a summer institute, consider the following questions:

1. Why would a teacher want to take time away from the summer to spend a week at your institute?
2. What are the incentives for attending the institute?
3. How will it be promoted?
4. Who will be targeted?
5. What will be taught?

Timeline of tasks:

1. Select institute theme, length, and size
2. Secure funding
3. Select dates and arrange location (meeting rooms, sleeping rooms, food, parking)
4. Develop agenda
5. Arrange for credit (if offered)
6. Identify and contact guest lecturers
7. Design publicity materials
8. Collect mailing lists
9. Print and mail publicity
10. Gather written materials
11. Register participants, send confirmations
12. Prepare institute notebooks

13. Remind speakers, collect resumes
14. Order food and audiovisual equipment
15. Prepare lessons
16. Arrange for late registrations and last minute details
17. Conduct institute—crisis management and damage control
18. Evaluation and clean up

The order in which these tasks are done will vary depending on personal preference and the characteristics and requirements of your organization. Each task, however, is important.

P.A.T.C.H./L.Y.C. 5-Day LRE Summer Institute

Thomas J. O'Donnell

Project P.A.T.C.H. (Participatory Awareness Through Community Help), the Law Youth and Citizenship Program of the New York State Bar Association (L.Y.C.), and the U.S. Department of Education sponsor a free 5-day LRE summer institute at Northport High School, Northport, NY. The training program features five LRE strands, allowing participants an opportunity to select a strand appropriate to their district's and their own civic values and LRE needs. The institute schedule is reproduced on the following page.

School board members, administrators, staff or students who are interested in attending the Institute must provide a letter of support from their school district to accompany their application. Enrollment is determined by a first come-first served basis for 125 educators and students. Inservice credits for participants are available at district discretion.

For further information, contact: Thomas J. O'Donnell, Director, Project P.A.T.C.H., Northport-East Northport UFSD, 110 Elwood Road, Northport, NY 11768, 516/261-9000.

5-Day Comprehensive Law-Related Education 1993 Summer Institute

Dates: June 28-29-30/July 1-2, 1993 **Time:** 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Place: Northport High School, Northport, NY 11768

LEC NYSBA

Registrant: Please select one of the strands below which you wish to attend and one field experience for Wednesday, June 30, 1993. Indicate your choice on the registration form below. Thank you.

***** Registration Deadline: Friday, June 11, 1993 *****

NOTE: Coffee will be served in the Commons area each morning from 8:30 to 9:00 a.m.

P.A.T.C.H./ EDUCATION LAW/ ADMINISTRATION	*AMERICAN HISTORY THRU CONSTITUTIONAL LAW*	*LEGAL SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT*	*CREATIVE LEADERSHIP AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT*	*FORENSIC SCIENCE*
6/28 AM Rm. H-223 Welcome/Overview; K-12 District-wide K-12 LRE Curriculum Review **PM** Methods/Activities for LEGAL (Law, Economics, & Gov't. in Am. Life)	**6/28 AM Rm. H-219** Welcome/Overview: Dist. of Con Law Resources, Activities & Strategies **PM** Activities & Strategies	**6/28 AM Library** Welcome/Overview: Civil Procedure Concepts **PM** Intentional Torts: Slander, Libel, Negligence	**6/28 AM Rm. H-104** Welcome/Overview; Nature of Leadership, Communication/Goal Setting/CORT **PM** Ways to Inspire Creative Thinking/Value Exploration/Prob. Solv./Decision Making/Community Issues	**6/28 AM Rm. S-115** Welcome/Overview; Crime Scene Lab Activities: Fingerprints, Latent Prints, Sketching & Recording the Scene **PM** Police Crime Scene Lab
6/29 AM Rm. H-223 Student Legal Governance; Leadership & Ethics; Peer Teaching; Ombudsperson **PM** Interactive Tech. & LRE; Grantwriting; Educ. Law	**6/29 AM Rm. H-219** Substantive Units (Case Law, Theory) **PM** Student Constitutional Law Casebook: Development, Design & Use	**6/29 AM Library** Contracts, Wills & Estates, Property, Domestic Relations **PM** Civil Law Activities & Strategies: Moot Court	**6/29 AM Rm. H-104** Cross Age Teaching; I.S.S.U.E.-Model Student Conference; Reader's Theatre; Story Scripting **PM** L.E.A.D. Student Panel, "It Shouldn't Hurt To Be a Child" (Sexual Abuse)	**6/29 AM Rm. S-115** Intro to Forensic Anthropology; Facial Reconstruction; Cases **PM** Lab: Estimating Stature & Height of Human Body
6/30 Choose One Field Experience: 1) District Court, Hauppauge; 2) Medical Examiner's Office, Hauppauge; 3) New York City Cop-Ride-Along; 4) Riverhead Jail Tour; 5) Seminar: Environmental Law in the '90s; 6) International Law Simulation (Lesson Plans, and Activity Design).				
7/01 AM Rm. H-223 Debrief: Field Experience & Grtwrting Hmwrk; C.J. Content: Police/Prison/ Prevention Cost/Legal Comm. Resources **PM** C.J. & Participation in Gov't.; 12th Grade	**7/01 AM Rm. H-219** Debrief: Field Experience; 11th Grade Curriculum Implementation; Compact for Learning **PM** Cooperative Learning Experience; Con Law "Certiorari" and "One on Ones"	**7/01 AM Library** Debrief: Field Experience; Criminal Law Substantive Content **PM** Criminal Law Activities & Strategies; Legal Research; Law Schools; Legal Writing Tech.; Educ. Law	**7/01 AM Rm. H-104** Debrief: Field Experience; Introduction to Conflict Management for Students & Schools **PM** A Training Program for Teachers and Students in Peer Mediation	**7/01 AM Rm. S-115** Debrief: Field Experience; Intro to DNA; Forensic & DNA Investigation Lab Activities **PM** Use of DNA in Solving Cases; Making Positive Identification; Cases
7/02 AM Rm. H-223 International Law; 9/10th Gr. Legal World Curr.; Global Contemp. Perspective; Mock Trial/Moot Court	**7/02 AM Rm. H-219** Formal Certiorari Arguments; Con Law "One On Ones"	**7/02 AM Library** Constitutional Law; Comm. of Educ. Rulings; Review Major Supreme Court Decisions Impacting LRE Instr. & Curr.; School Law	**7/02 AM Rm. H-104** Ethical Student Leadership Lessons/Activities; "Good Planets Are Hard to Find" Environmental Workshop	**7/02 AM Rm. S-115** What's New in Forensics; Computers Help Crimes; Practical Applications for Forensics in HS Classes
PM **General Topics:** Funding, Assessment, Careers, Service	**PM**	**PM** **** Participants Will Meet in the HS Library ****	**PM**	**PM**

The Ohio Mock Trial Program: A Cornerstone for Law-Related Education in Ohio

Debra Hallock Phillips

The first high school mock trial competition took place in Washington, D.C. in 1972 as part of the district's Street Law Program. In 1992, more than 38 states held statewide competitions and were eligible to participate in a national competition which has been held every spring since 1986. This article describes a mock trial program which began in Ohio in 1983 and examines the mock trial as one approach to law-related education.

The Ohio Mock Trial Program is the founding program of the Ohio Center for Law-Related Education. It is designed to help students become responsible citizens by:

1. developing a practical understanding of the way in which the American legal system functions;
2. encouraging cooperation among educators, students, legal professionals and the general community;

Debra Hallock Phillips is Executive Director of the Ohio Center for Law-Related Education. For further information, contact her at P.O. Box 16562, Columbus, OH 43216-6562, 614/487-2050.

3. increasing understanding of our constitutional rights and responsibilities;
4. improving basic skills such as listening, speaking, reading and reasoning; and
5. recognizing students' academic and intellectual achievements.

Case and Competition Materials

Each year volunteer attorneys formulate a well-founded case involving a constitutional issue relevant to students' lives. The most successful hypothetical cases have involved automobiles, alcohol and substance abuse codes, racial and ethnic intimidation, and HIV—topics with high student interest that provide the opportunity for young people to discuss critical issues of responsibility while at the same time presenting issues of due process and constitutional guarantees. Through the study of such materials and hearing both sides of a case during a simulated trial, students realize that freedom is not absolute, that the rights of others must be respected and that our system of justice, while imperfect, is the best system available for a political system based on the rule of law.

Volunteer attorneys under the direction of a staff member and educator serve each year as a case writing committee and may spend as many as 750 hours to develop the case synopsis, pleadings, summary of depositions, exhibits, case law and constitutional provisions. A competition manual, drafted by a staff member and attorney, includes a competition dateline, competition instructions, Modified Rules of Evidence, competition forms, scoresheets and a glossary. Mock trial competition information usually adds another 30-40 pages to the 140-150 pages of the previously described mock trial case materials.

In addition, four video training tapes have been prepared to train participants and volunteers in the competition:

- "MTV" (Mock Trial Video), featuring trial presentation techniques;
- "Mock Trial Bench Video," demonstrating techniques for scoring and judging the competition;
- "Mock Trial Case Video," a current case summary that helps students prepare their arguments for competition; and
- "State Tournament Championship Video Tape," an edited record of the top two teams from the previous year for review by teachers and students.

A mock trial training session staffed by legal volunteers and educators is offered as part of a statewide Law and Citizenship Conference. Teachers who attend are briefed on the constitutional issue presented in the case, the use of case materials in the classroom, and methods of instruction to prepare students to present mock trials. All teachers at the conference receive a copy of the case and competition materials, as well as the four videotapes. Thus equipped, teachers are encouraged to use these materials in their classes, with the option of entering a team of nine students in academic competition. Teachers who cannot locate a lawyer to serve as a legal advisor are matched with one through the Center.

Organization and Implementation of Mock Trial Competition

A survey of state finalists indicated that volunteer attorneys may spend as many as 100 hours assisting their team and that students often practice many more additional hours. We believe that this kind of dedication deserves the same kind of recognition accorded student athletes and has built such recognition into the program. Certificates, pins and posters are provided for more than 2,000 student participants, for over 550 volunteers who act as judicial panelists and legal advisors, for teachers who coach student teams, and for all district site coordinators from local bar associations and courts who organize district level competitions. All state quarterfinalists receive T-shirts and are honored at an awards banquet at the state capitol the night before the championship round. Awards, trophies and mementos for the four semifinalist teams are also provided in addition to a $5,000 award to the champion to help defray the expenses of participating in the national competition.

To maximize student learning in the competition, each team must take the role of both plaintiff and defendant and participate in two trials against different high schools. Outstanding witnesses and attorneys are selected after each trial to recognize individual performances and teams are scored on a scale of 1-10 for their team performance; the decision does not consider the merits of the case. The winning team is not announced at the end of each trial, but the individual awards are presented along with debriefing remarks from the judicial panelists. It is not until the end of the day, when competition has concluded, that the teams gather for an awards ceremony which announces which team will advance to state competition. A tally sheet of all team scores is posted

for teachers to review later with their students. In addition, teams are encouraged to videotape their performances for follow-up discussion with legal advisors. These tapes may also be used to recruit and train next year's students and to promote the program.

To insure a positive experience for the greatest number of participants, a system of checks and balances is employed throughout the program. Judges are trained, provided with lunch and an experienced jurist sits on each panel. A real judge presides over the trial, rules on objections, and generally helps make the trial a positive educational experience. The presiding judge is assisted by two lawyers whose major task is to score the trial; in addition, the judicial panels are selected to reflect racial and ethnic diversity. Competition questions may be answered by professional staff and sponsor volunteers are available at all competition sites or by the Center's toll-free telephone number. A complaint process has been established which allows filing of a "mock appeal" within ten days of the competition. Although the complaint does not change the outcome, it is seriously investigated and followed up with written response.

Impact of Mock Trial on Learning

A proficiency test mandated by the Ohio General Assembly was administered to Ohio students for the first time in the fall of 1990. We are convinced that participation in the Ohio Mock Trial Program makes a difference in the level of students' civic proficiency, a belief supported by a recent report of the National Assessment of Educational Progress conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Education. This assessment measured the civics achievement of 11,000 students nationwide in grades 4, 8, and 12. When twelfth graders were asked how often they participated in mock trials, mock elections or mock governmental bodies, 36.3% said once or twice, 11.6% several times, and 52.1% never. Significantly, the 11.6% performed better on the assessment test than those who never or occasionally participated. The continued opportunity for Ohio secondary students to participate in the Ohio Mock Trial Program should help students improve their citizenship competencies through learning about the legal process and the constitution during a simulated trial.

The active, participatory learning experience provided by the program has a greater impact on student knowledge of constitutional rights

and responsibilities, which should have a lasting influence on their future behavior. We hope that the skills, knowledge, and attitudes growing out of this experience will help our future citizens make responsible decisions in the voting booth, during jury service, behind the wheel of an automobile, at home, and in the workplace.

Teachers, as well as students, benefit from the mock trial participation. They receive instruction in teaching strategies that improve their teaching skills and are provided with case materials that motivate and inform their students. As team coaches, teachers experience the satisfaction that results from developing an intellectual rapport with a team of students and have an opportunity to network with the legal community through the lawyer who advises the team. Legal advisors also report a sense of fulfillment that results from performing a community service and acting as positive role models for young people.

The mock trial competition attempts to prepare students for responsible citizenship by providing a teacher-driven model of experiential learning—a simulated trial. This program is available to all Ohio high schools, creating a partnership between the legal and educational communities, providing an immediate benefit for teachers, students, and lawyers and promoting long-term benefits for our democratic society.

The Jefferson Meeting

Mary E. Kennedy

A Jefferson Meeting is a structured discussion, in a town meeting format, that involves participants in serious analysis of constitutional issues. While much like what a constitutional convention might be if delegates were to gather to discuss the adequacy of the Constitution and its provisions for government in contemporary America, the purpose of a Jefferson Meeting is to educate rather than to pursue political change. The emphasis is on the debate itself and the process of exchanging ideas by involving delegates (students) in study and debate about issues related to the structure and performance of American national government.

The Jefferson Meeting format works well in many different situations: 1) with one teacher and one class over a period of three to six days; 2) with several classes together for a full day if advance preparation time is allowed; 3) with groups of students and parents in an afternoon and an evening session with preparation time allowed before the Meeting; and 4) with several schools joining together in a Friday evening or Saturday session.

Jefferson Meetings are appropriate for middle school students and above. For four years a middle school in Princeton, New Jersey, has sponsored a Jefferson Meeting involving their students and a local senior

Mary E. Kennedy is Executive Director of the The Jefferson Foundation.

citizens group. The Fairfax County, Virginia school system has prepared a special Jefferson Meeting guide for the middle grades. Jefferson Meetings also work very well with students of all ability levels, including both advanced placement and English as a second language classes.

To prepare for a meeting, students and their teacher first select the constitutional issues they wish to examine from a list of nine Jefferson Foundation issues; four or five are selected depending upon the time available. The Jefferson Foundation has prepared a guide for each of these issues, which are:

1. *The electoral college system of selecting the president.* Is the electoral college the fairest and best method of selecting the president?
2. *The term and powers of the president.* Would the president be more or less effective if limited to a single six-year term?
3. *Article V, the provision to amend the Constitution by convention.* Should we call a national constitutional convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution?
4. *The term and tenure of members of Congress.* Would the Congress be more or less effective if terms were lengthened and/or tenure limited?
5. *The separation of powers with regard to the legislative and line-item vetoes.* Would a legislative or line-item veto make government more effective or would it upset the balance of power?
6. *The independence and accountability of the judicial branch.* Should federal judges and Supreme Court justices be subject to a fixed term or retirement age?
7. *Campaign contributions and the public good.* Can campaign contributions be regulated so as not to interfere with the rights to free speech and association?
8. *Direct democracy and representative government.* Would a provision for a national initiative and referendum undermine our system of representative government?
9. *The Bill of Rights.* Does the Bill of Rights adequately protect the fundamental rights of American citizens?

The format of a Jefferson Meeting, which is similar to that of a town meeting, is clearly defined and easy to replicate. After the teacher and students select the issues, the meeting has four basic stages:

1. *The opening session*. This is an overview of the issues presented by a "scholar(s)" who may be the classroom teacher or an outside speaker and can range in time from 15 minutes to one hour.
2. *Issue committee meetings*. Students divide into groups according to the particular issue they select and discuss that issue in committee, read the appropriate Jefferson guide, conduct additional research if desired, divide into pro and con sides on the issue, and identify the individuals who will prepare pro and con arguments for presentation in the plenary session (perhaps two or three speakers on each side, depending upon time available).
3. *The plenary session*. This is the main event of the Jefferson Meeting. All participants gather and the pro and con sides present their arguments within a set time limit (three minutes each seems to work well) to the entire session. Floor debate by the entire group follows each issue.
4. *Follow-up activities*. It is important for students to summarize and analyze informally the arguments presented in the plenary session. One possible procedure is to have each issue group choose a reporter to summarize the plenary debate.

A Jefferson Meeting has a number of objectives. It teaches the content of the Constitution, and it links the Constitution directly with current issues. Students must speak, reason, question, and evaluate the consequences of positions. Meetings give students an introduction to civic participation by requiring public speaking and respect for opposing viewpoints. Jefferson Meetings have been called history lessons with a focus on the present and civics lessons with historical perspective. As one organizer commented, "The format of the Jefferson Meeting has a great deal to do with its effectiveness. It's sure-fire."

The first Jefferson Meeting was held in Williamsburg, Virginia in 1984, attended by 150 people from all over the state, including educators, politicians, government officials, leaders of civic groups, housewives, and others. The meeting proved so successful that another soon followed in Illinois. Because of the concept's effectiveness in the adult community, teachers requested help in adapting the format for classroom use. The Jefferson Foundation developed and produced classroom materials and, by 1992, Jefferson Meetings had been held in classrooms all over the United States.

The Jefferson Foundation is a private, nonpartisan, and nonadvocacy foundation funded by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the U.S. Department of Education, and the Ford Foundation among others.

A teacher's guide to a Jefferson Meeting, issue guides—one set prepared for students and one for adults—and pocket copies of the Constitution are available from Mary E. Kennedy, The Jefferson Foundation, 1529 18th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036, 202/234-3688.

Attorneys Take Their Case to Class: The National MENTOR Program–Law Firm/High School Partnerships

Jo Rosner

Introduction

The MENTOR Program establishes a unique partnership between law firms and high school classes, providing students with a more realistic view of the legal profession. Through MENTOR, young people interact with attorneys in the classroom, at the law firm and in the courtroom. MENTOR attorneys and teachers help students understand the pervasiveness of the law in their lives and give students some sense of the situations they will confront in their role as citizens. Lawyers become role models who aim to instill respect for the law based on the "contagion of example."

The MENTOR Program is guided by five basic goals:

- To increase student understanding and appreciation of the legal system of the United States.

Jo Rosner is Program Director for the National MENTOR Program. For further information, contact her in care of the Washington State Bar Association, Public Affairs, 500 Westin Building, 2001 6th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98121-2599, 206/727-8282.

- To help students achieve a participatory role in our democratic society.
- To help students become more aware of their rights and responsibilities as citizens.
- To guide students in recognizing the impact of the law in their lives.
- To provide information on possible careers related to the justice system.

The Washington State Bar Association's program is one example of the adoption and implementation of MENTOR. In 1984, the bar was seeking a way to improve the image of lawyers in the state and, at the same time, improve law-related education in high schools. A seminar about the MENTOR Program was being held in Washington, D.C., presented by MENTOR founder Thomas Evans, of the firm of Mudge Rose Guthrie Alexander & Ferdon. The Washington Bar sent a representative to attend, and, based on the representative's report, recommended that the program be adopted on a statewide basis. A pilot project of five partnerships was established in diverse geographical locations of the state. At the end of the first year, the pilot participants (lawyers, teachers and students) evaluated the partnerships. The responses were extremely positive and over the next six years, more than fifty additional partnerships were formed.

MENTOR has proven adaptable to many variations of program design. Large law firms and solo practitioners report equally successful experiences. Attorneys in the public sector, such as the Office of the Attorney General and the County Prosecutor's Office in Washington State, have used the same general program design used by private law firms and have also seen their work with the schools meet with an enthusiastic reception.

The following program components have formed the basis for MENTOR's effectiveness, endurance and expansion over the past nine years:

Orientation (lawyers visit the school)

One or more representatives of the sponsoring firm describe the program and speak generally about the profession.

Law as a Profession (students visit the firm)

Students see a realistic (rather then a made-for-TV) view of lawyers and law-related vocations.

Visit to Court (civil or criminal, state or federal)

Students observe a trial or appeals hearing and explore the meaning of their observation during lunch with the lawyers and/or judges.

Electives (at least one added to basic program)

Examples: a mock trial, a moot court hearing, a visit to a detention center, a lesson in legal writing.

Recruitment

The initial task of recruiting MENTOR lawyers is essentially one of research—finding the lawyers or law firms that have shown an interest in law-related education or who are known to contribute pro bono time for the welfare of the community. Young lawyers groups in particular are often interested in community outreach programs. Once a few truly enthusiastic attorneys are identified, the initial pilot program requires only the addition of equally enthusiastic educators.

Social Studies department heads are usually able to help identify those teachers who have shown a particular interest in law-related education. However, MENTOR's experience indicates that business law teachers, as well as debate and Family Life teachers, can also be potential MENTOR partners.

Another form of recruitment in Washington State is a one-week summer institute, entitled "Classroom to Courtroom," offered at Seattle Pacific University. Taught by the director of MENTOR, this credit course for social studies middle and secondary school teachers inspires many of its participants to volunteer as MENTOR partners.

No one formula for recruitment seems to have emerged from the existing programs around the nation. Circumstances vary so widely from state to state and school district to school district that no single approach seems to fit the different circumstances. Within Washington State there currently are 60 partnerships (120 teachers and attorneys), with a waiting list of volunteers who have expressed interest.

Training

In a statewide program, regional training workshops can be scheduled after school. In some states, attorneys may receive CLE credits for their participation while teachers may receive credit according to school district policy.

The format is flexible, and can be adapted to suit the needs of each

group. Timely legal topics can be discussed and LRE materials presented. New MENTOR volunteers should be oriented to the use of experiential, hands-on teaching strategies. Two useful resources are the ABA/YEFC's magazine *Update on Law-Related Education* and the ABA's videotapes, *Anatomy of a Civil Trial* and *Anatomy of a Criminal Trial*. All MENTOR volunteers in the Washington State program also receive the *MENTOR Handbook*, which contains a description of the program, a listing of all the MENTOR partnerships within the state and teaching tips for lawyers and teachers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE